

Alexander Fedorov

**100 most popular Soviet
television movies and TV
series: opinions of film
critics and viewers**

Moscow, 2021

Fedorov A.V. 100 most popular Soviet television movies and TV series: opinions of film critics and viewers. Moscow: "Information for all", 2021. 144 p.

What does the list of the hundred most popular Soviet television films and TV series look like? How did the press and viewers evaluate and rate these films?

In this monograph, for the first time, an attempt is made to give a panorama of the hundred most popular Soviet television films and serials in the mirror of the opinions of film critics, film critics and viewers.

The monograph is intended for high school teachers, students, graduate students, researchers, film critics, film experts, journalists, as well as for a circle of readers who are interested in the problems of cinema, film criticism and film sociology.

Reviewer: Professor M.P. Thselyh.

© Alexander Fedorov, 2021.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
100 most popular Soviet television movies and TV series: opinions of film critics and viewers	5
Interview on the release of the book "One Thousand and One Highest Grossing Soviet Movie: Opinions of Film Critics and Viewers"	119
List of "100 most popular Soviet television films and TV series.....	125
About the Author	135
References	140

Introduction

What does the list of the hundred most popular Soviet television films and TV series look like? How did the press and viewers evaluate and rate these films?

In this monograph, for the first time, an attempt is made to give a panorama of the hundred most popular Soviet television movies and serials in the mirror of the opinions of film critics and viewers.

The book cites articles and reviews of Soviet and Russian film critics, audience reviews on the portals "Kino-teatr.ru" and "Kinopoisk", some parts of this text have been preliminary tested on the Yandex platform, on the portals "Kino-teatr.ru" and Kinopressa.ru and Facebook.

Alas, it is not possible to estimate the size of the audience for the premiere screenings of Soviet television films. It is believed, for example, that at least one hundred million viewers watched New Year's TV premieres in the USSR.

The book "100 most popular Soviet television movies and TV series: opinions of film critics and viewers" is a kind of supplement to the monograph: Fedorov, A. (2021). One thousand and one highest-grossing Soviet movies: opinions of film critics and viewers. Moscow: "Information for all", 1134 p. https://mediagram.ru/netcat_files/108/110/h_6890c972de504cob3ff8887cb74c2edd

I hope that the material in this book can be useful for higher education teachers, students, graduate students, researchers, film critics, film experts, journalists, as well as for a wide range of readers who are interested in the history of cinematography and TV, the problems of cinema, film criticism and film sociology.

100 most popular Soviet television movies and TV series: opinions of film critics and viewers

12 Chairs. USSR, 1976. Director and screenwriter Mark Zakharov (based on the novel of the same name by I. Ilf and E. Petrov). Actors: Andrey Mironov, Anatoly Papanov, Rolan Bykov, Georgy Vitsin, Nikolay Skorobogatov, Oleg Tabakov, Tatiana Peltzer, Lyubov Polishchuk, Natalia Zhuravleva, Lidia Fedoseeva–Shukshina, Vera Orlova, Mark Prudkin, Savely Bozh Kramarov, Boris Proskurin, Elena Shanina and others. **TV premiere: January 2, 1977.**

Mark Zakharov (1933–2019) was a famous theater director, but his films, shot for television ("12 Chairs", "Ordinary Miracle", "This Same Munchausen", "Formula of Love"), had great success with the audience.

They say that when the TV premiere of "12 Chairs" by Mark Zakharov took place on New Year's holidays in 1977, there was no limit to Leonid Gaidai's indignation. Still would! Mark Zakharov dared to enter his "reserved" cinema territory!

By the way, the main film journals of the USSR – "Soviet Screen" and "Cinema Art" – in the year of the premiere of this film by Mark Zakharov bypassed him in silence, although often (especially "Cinema Art") they wrote about television films.

Much later, Mark Zakharov himself said about his "12 Chairs" as follows: "The film came out protracted, almost without location filming, plywood scenery, a lot of offscreen text. In general, not God knows what!" (Quoted from: Pozdnyakova, 2016).

I personally like Zakharov's "12 Chairs", which I wrote about in this article (Fedorov, 1991).

Opinions of viewers about "12 chairs" are still, as a rule, polar, and the dispute, for example, on the Kino–teatr.ru portal has been going on for several years:

"Pro":

"In my opinion, Mironov and Papanov are the real Ostap Bender and Kisa Vorobyandinov. They were born to play these roles!" (A. Golovinsky).

"In my opinion, Zakharov's movie is definitely better than Gaidai's. And funnier and more musical. ... I am also pinned by director's tricks" (Denis).

"Contra":

"The main drawback of the film is that it is ... boring. There is simply no worse accusation for the adaptation of a comedy masterpiece" (M. Kirillov).

"The only failure of Mark Zakharov, films in his "proprietary" genre were much better for him. Mironov frankly replays (but is excellent in musical numbers)" (Ilya).

About Little Red Riding Hood. USSR, 1977. Directed by Leonid Nechaev. Screenwriter Inna Vetkina (based on the fairy tale "Little Red Riding Hood" by Charles Perrault). Actors: Yana Poplavskaya, Rina Zelenaya, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vladimir Basov, Nikolay Trofimov, Galina Volchek, Rolan Bykov, Stefania Stanyuta, Maria Barabanova, Maria Vinogradova, Yuri Belov, Dmitry Iosifov and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1977.**

Leonid Nechaev (1939–2010) directed 16 full-length feature films. These were mainly TV films shot in the genre of fairy tales. And the most famous cinematic tales of Leonid Nechaev were "Adventures of Buratino" and "About Little Red Riding Hood."

The secret of the audience success of the film "About Little Red Riding Hood" is similar to "Adventures of Buratino": a wonderful acting ensemble, a funny script, the kingdom of the musical element, sparkling replicas of characters, an impressive range of colors...

Opinions of modern viewers about the film "About Little Red Riding Hood" are sometimes polar.

"Pro":

"The film was shot with elements of a musical, which the director will not change in any of his fairy tales. The film is successful again, the song "If a long, long, long..." performed by Olya Rozhdestvenskaya became a hit. And for young Yana Poplavskaya, the leading actress, boys from all over the Union write declarations of love. But the film itself was far from simple. There are practically no comedy attractions in the film, which were so rich in "Adventures of Buratino", there are fewer fights, brawls and other elements of an adventure film. The film "About Little Red Riding Hood" is more melancholy or something" (M. Kirillov).

"It's quite a decent children's movie. I doubt that someone will be able to shoot better, given that the fundamental principle of Charles Perrault does not have two full pages per script. ... Quotations alone – for a whole volume... Beautiful songs" (A. Miroshin).

"Contra":

"This film should not be shown to young children. Such a Little Red Riding Hood can only scare her with her shouts... And Poplavskaya was quite in her place here. ... But the rest of the directors is clearly too clever. Even if we close our eyes to the inconsistency with the original source, which, I agree, is simple enough for a two-part film, it is still fenced in here. And it is not clear for what purposes. ... What is all this for? An adult can't figure it out here, and even children of school age, after watching, will at best be puzzled from what they see" (Andrey).

"This film is a rare tedious thing! More or less he sticks to Rybnikov's music, and even then songs with endless repetition of one word... All this miserable and tedious "action" suggests that the film crew gathered at the resort to relax, and at the same time something shoot. And this is doubly offensive, because the actors involved are really great – our favorite actors!" (N. Rozhkova).

Adjutant of His Excellency. USSR, 1969. Directed by Evgeny Tashkov. Screenwriters Igor Bolgarin, Georgy Seversky. Actors: Yuri Solomin, Alexander Milokosty, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Vladimir Kozel, Tatiana Ivanitskaya, Evgeny Shutov, Nikolai Timofeev, Andrey Petrov, Victor Pavlov, Evgeny Tashkov, Yuri Nazarov, Valentin Grachev, Evgeny Teterin, Larisa Danilina, Nikolai Karbbe, Gennady Valois, Oleg Golubitsky, Valentin Smirnitsky, Igor Starygin, Nikolai Gritsenko, Sofya Pavlova, Anatoly Papanov, Mikhail Kokshenov, Lyudmila Chursina and others. **TV premiere: April 1970.**

Director Evgeny Tashkov (1926–2012) directed 11 films, three of which ("Thirst", "Come Tomorrow" and "Crime") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films. And this is not counting his main hits – the television series "Major "Whirlwind" and "Adjutant of His Excellency".

In the year of the TV premiere "Adjutant of His Excellency" the Soviet film press greeted him on the whole warmly (Revich, 1970: 2–3; Tulyakova, 1970: 13–15).

For example, the film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) wrote that "the merit of the authors of "Adjutant..." is that they were able to develop not only a very exciting, but also a very meaningful plot. ... The image of Koltsov, performed by Y. Solomin, will undoubtedly enter the gallery of the best film images of the Chekists, along with, for example, Major Fedotov from "The Exploit of the Scout" or Ladeinikov from "Dead Season". ... But no less a success of the picture and the second central character – General Kovalevsky, played by V. Strzhelchik. This image is far from the common clichés by which other "whites" are cut. Kovalevsky of Strzhelchik is intelligent, soft, as much as possible for a military man. This is a man like Alexei Turbin from the play by M. Bulgakov. It outlines the features of those representatives of the "White Guard" who later, finding themselves at a broken trough in emigration, realize the injustice of the cause for which they fought. ... One of the main advantages of the film, one of the main advantages of E. Tashkov's directorial work, is close attention to the development of characters, and not only the main characters, but also episodic ones. ...

There are, however, two lines in the film, which seem to me to be a much gross miscalculation. The first of them is associated with the image of the dad Angel, This caricatured type penetrated into the film from somewhere from an operetta. The performance of the beloved A. Papanov only enhances the impression of operetta, completely incompatible with the strict, authentic style of the work. Even more perplexing is the hero's love line. It is even difficult to

understand why she was introduced into the picture. If the authors decided: what about such a long film – and suddenly without love, then they clearly underestimated their own material. The romantic, mysterious, enticing atmosphere of the meetings between Koltsov and Tanya is inappropriate, the play of the actress T. Ivanitskaya is inexpressive, and Y. Solomin becomes sugary and pretentious in these episodes. True, the love scenes do not take up much space in the film and do not manage to inflict irreparable damage on Koltsov's image" (Revich, 1970: 2-3).

Film critic Konstantin Shcherbakov also reacted very positively to this film, stressing that "with all the dynamism, tension, acuteness of the action in the picture, there are no (or almost no) artificial heaps, complications and turns that would have been introduced for the sake of entertainment as such, for the sake of maintaining purely event-driven interest and would not help the cognition of human characters. There are many acting in the film persons, however, there are few purely service figures, even episodic characters, as a rule, are endowed with an individuality, which in some cases is only outlined, and in others it is given in detail. ... The authors of the film "Adjutant of His Excellency" are not fond of surveillance, pursuits, shootings, in general – especially spectacular scenes (although they are done quite well). Director B. Tashkov and cameraman P. Terpsikhov think more about how to achieve internal contact of the audience with what is happening on the screen, therefore there are many close-ups in the film, bringing the faces closer to us, the eyes of the actors, helping to penetrate deep into the characters" (Shcherbakov, 1970: 59–60).

True, K. Shcherbakov also noted "plot strains – ... for example, the story of the miraculous rescue of the railroad workers who helped Koltsov, and the poorly motivated appearance of one of the underground workers at the white headquarters, which was necessary only for Yura to accidentally recognize him and understand who why go to His Excellency's adjutant. And the actor's "numbers" – for example, the pop-concert performance of the role of a jeweler by B. Novikov falling out of the general tone. The reproaches could be multiplied, but, in essence, they all boil down to one thing: the authors play where they betray themselves, fall under the power of the bad canons of an adventure film" (Shcherbakov, 1970: 60).

Already in the 21st century, the journal Rodina published an article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Andrei Ganin (Ganin, 2015: 61–66), where a detailed analysis was made of comparing the realities of the civil war with the detective story told in the film "Adjutant to His Excellency." And researcher E. Volkov, in my opinion, rightly noted that in this film by E. Tashkov "there are scenes that previously would have been simply unthinkable for Soviet cinema" (Volkov, 2010).

My opinion about the film you can find here (Fedorov, 1991).

The views of current audience about "Adjutant of His Excellency" is usually quite positive:

"Wonderful TV series. People are shown not black or white, but alive. The daughter of a white general loves a Bolshevik. The Bolshevik became attached to the son of the white colonel. The White General (V. Strzhelchik) is an intelligent and subtle person. Very expressive music" (Ella).

"One of my favorite films. And I love him, first of all, because the whites are shown in a completely different light than in many films of that time, although I am in no hurry to idealize them..." (Tanya).

Adventures of Buratino. USSR, 1975. Directed by Leonid Nechaev. Screenwriter Inna Vetkina (based on the tale of Alexei Tolstoy). Actors: Dmitry Iosifov, Tatiana Protsenko, Roma Stolkarts, Tomas Augustinas, Grigory Svetlorusov, Nikolai Grinko, Vladimir Etush, Vladimir Basov, Elena Sanaeva, Rolan Bykov, Rina Zelenaya and others. **Premiere on TV: January 1, 1976.**

Leonid Nechaev (1939–2010) directed 16 full-length feature films. These were mainly TV films shot in the genre of fairy tales. And the most famous cinematic tales of Leonid Nechaev were "Adventures of Buratino" and "About Little Red Riding Hood".

In the early 1970s, the main Soviet film storytellers Alexander Rowe (1906–1973) and Alexander Ptushko (1900–1973) passed away, and the director Leonid Nechaev, who made his debut in 1974, became the only successful rival of the film storyteller Nadezhda Kosheverova (1902–1989).

In my opinion, in "Adventures of Buratino" almost every actor is one hundred percent in the role, and the whole movie tale is based on improvisation, musicality, bold play with the "canonical" text. It was, in fact, an excellent gift to the multi-million TV audience on the first day of the new 1976...

Film critic Yevgeny Vasiliev writes about this movie fairy tale like this: "The movie "Adventures of Buratino" by Leonid Nechaev is a mystery. If you read the reviews of foreigners on IMDB, then this suspicion only intensifies. For some reason, Americans are the first to repeat about weirdness, mystery, miracles. In Russia, this weirdness is not noticed and they love the film in a simple, home-like way. But tenderly and faithfully. ...

Seemingly unpretentious plot, simple story and such popularity. What's the matter here? ... "Adventures of Buratino", like many other Soviet films, slipped "between the two cannot be united" – between the hammer of censorship and the hard place of bad taste, and thus acquired aesthetic chic and elegance. This is the secret of the success of many Soviet films, including "Adventures of Buratino". ... Mark Lipovetsky in "Cinema Art" explains the popularity of Buratino's image by the fact that he became a harbinger of the appearance of simulacra, that is, creatures without essence – the true reality of the postmodern world. In popular culture, the role of simulacra is, for example, Pokemon or Teletubbies. According to Lipovetsky, both Buratino and Pokémon and Teletubbies encapsulate a sea of charm in themselves and do not need the props of external reality.

... There is an idea of a clearly defined goal, a prize, so characteristic, for example, of cult cinema. Take, for example, "Stalker", "Outskirts" or "Koktebel". The plot of these works is based on the achievement of the ultimate goal and the subsequent transition from an inauthentic Existence into a genuine Existence. In auteur cinema, a version of a road movie with a sacred finish is obtained. Buratino is also looking for the "Golden Key" in spite of the danger. He is deceived, almost set on fire, hanged, imprisoned. But everything is nothing in front of a mystical goal. Having overcome all adversities, Buratino penetrates into a new dimension, acquires eternal life. This myth, which is the basis of both the film and the literary prototype, has an alluring depth and magic. ... A huge part of the success of "Adventures of Buratino" belongs to the composer. If they say that the goalkeeper is half a team, then Alexei Rybnikov is 2/3 of the crew. The soulful melody of his serenades struck the audience on the spot. ... I am sure that "Adventures of Buratino" is just beginning. The plot of this fairy tale has such a semantic potential that there is not a shadow of a doubt that not a single feature film with such a title will be shot yet. The day will come and we will see something no less great. Something will happen, something else will happen!" (Vasiliev, 2008).

Spectators of the XXI century remember "Adventures of Buratino" with pleasure:

"The best film about Buratino has not yet been staged. And, alas, they are unlikely to deliver. Actors are real stars" (G. Wang).

"Awesome musical. A real masterpiece. Equally interesting for children and adults. The harmony of Rybnikov's magnificent music and Okudzhava's poems. The works of Rolan Bykov and Elena Sanaeva, Vladimir Etush and Vladimir Basov, Rina Zelena and Katina-Yartsev, Nikolai Grinko and others are beyond praise. Each image hits the top ten" (Paul).

"The film "Adventures of Buratino" is simply great. ... I really love the film for its interesting plot, acting, for its brightness, color, for its songs and music. ... At that time I always wanted to go to some other world – to a fairy-tale world. I think many children do too. I very often believed that there is such a door, you need to find a key and open it. And not necessarily this door behind the painted hearth in old Carlo's closet. ... I always believed that miracles begin there, there is a magical fairyland, there is another world" (Valery).

"Brightness of colors, wonderful music, witty lyrics – all this attracted the attention of young viewers to the film. However, there were some nuances in the children's perception of the film. Naturally, everyone liked the cheerful wooden man Buratino (Dima Iosifov), who constantly fooled his opponents, who dreamed of robbing him. But negative characters, for example, the fox Alice and the cat Basilio, were not bypassed by the love of the audience, so these rascals were charming and spontaneous. ... As the film progressed, it seemed that Basilio and Alice were enjoying the process of inflating Buratino (otherwise they would have robbed him at the first meeting) – they like to play and play the fool" (M. Kirillov).

Adventures of Electronic. USSR, 1979. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriter Evgeny Veltistov (based on his own book). Actors: Yuri Torsuev, Vladimir Torsuev, Vasily Modest, Oksana Alekseeva, Maxim Kalinin, Dmitry Maksimov, Evgeny Livshits, Valeria Soluyan, Nikolay Grinko, Elizaveta Nikishchikhina, Vladimir Basov, Nikolai Karachentsov, Evgeny Vesnik, Maya Bulgakova, Nikolai Makoyarsky, Roza Yuri Chernov, Lev Perfilov and others. **TV premiere: May 2, 1980.**

Konstantin Bromberg (1939–2020) directed only four full-length feature films, two of which — "Adventures of Electronic" and "The Wizards" — immediately fell in love with the multimillion TV audience.

In the year of its appearance on TV screens, "Adventures of Electronic" seemed purely childish fantasy with a funny plot and pleasant music.

But after several decades, this film not only became a cult, but also served as the basis for several dissertations and cultural studies.

And already in the 21st century, culturologist Ilya Kuklin noted that the "social" message "of the film about Electronic ... can be interpreted as follows: no, the ideas and practices of the "sixties" are not discredited, they can still be reanimated, despite a temporary defeat — but if two conditions: if the "sixties" do not "format" the next generation in their own image and likeness, and if this next generation reveals the ability for self-organization and self-development" (Kuklin, 2008).

Many of today's viewers still recall with nostalgia "Adventures of Electronic" as a favorite film of their childhood:

"This is my favorite childhood movie! All songs from this movie are the best! And the film itself is the best Soviet film!" (Vika).

"It's my favorite movie! The only film from which nothing could distract me. When the film ended, I was sad for a long time" (Spectator).

"A lovely film from childhood, magic music. The best of children's science fiction" (Andros).

Adventures of Petrov and Vasechkin, Ordinary and Incredible. USSR, 1983. Directed by Vladimir Alenikov. Scriptwriters Vladimir Alenikov, Valentin Gorlov. Actors: Dmitry Barkov, Yegor Druzhinin, Inga Ilm, Alyosha Gusev, Maxim Polyansky, Sveta Protasenkova, Andrei Kanevsky, Yuri Medvedev, Inna Alenikova, Lyudmila Ivanova, Tatiana Bozhok, Alexander Lenkov, Anatoly Kuznetsov and others. **TV premiere: June 1, 1984.**

Vladimir Alenikov directed 17 full-length feature films and several episodes of "Yeralash". The comedy for children "Adventures of Petrov and Vasechkin, Ordinary and Incredible" is perhaps his most popular work.

In the year of the release of "Adventures of Petrov and Vasechkin," they were greeted by the underage audience with great enthusiasm.

But the opinions of 21st century viewers about this film are often opposite.

"Pro":

"I now perceive this film as a masterpiece of children's cinema, it looks so modern. The director is just great, great work with children, with a script. I have not been little for a long time, but I downloaded this film to my collection and I watch it when I want to remember my childhood, and just for fun" (Zhenya).

"The film is a complete delight! So kind, light, humorous, just sparkling with some kind of zest for life. And the actors are all top class! Very charismatic" (Gil).

"Great movie! ... Excellent, professional acting, cool choreography, great songs... And Vasechkin is the love of Soviet girls!" (Alya).

I watched "Adventures of Petrov and Vasechkin" as a preschool child. It was love at first sight. And forever! Witty jokes, situations, "pictures". Children's faces are cool. Vasechkin is the most important prankster – adventurer. And the main thing is that the humor here is purely

childish, which only a childish head can give birth to. As soon as adults could invent such jokes. And the songs!" (Olga).

"Contra":

"The film is shoddy. I don't understand how anyone can like him. Quickie" (Prol).

"This movie did not impress me either as a child or as an adult. The plot of the film is divided into small stories, which were more successfully played out in Soviet school comedies. ... The intrigue, of course, is trouble-free: few people will be left indifferent by two young mischief-makers who are in love with one girl, an activist. But since one friend always dominates, and the other gives in, then all the love in the picture is of a dull character" (Sveta).

Adventures of Prince Florizel. USSR, 1979. Directed by Evgeny Tatarsky. Scriptwriter Edgar Dubrovsky (based on the series of stories "The Suicide Club" and "Rajah's Diamond" by R.L. Stevenson). Actors: Oleg Dal, Donatas Banionis, Igor Dmitriev, Lyubov Polishchuk, Elena Solovey, Boris Novikov, Vladimir Shevelkov, Mikhail Pugovkin, Vladimir Basov, Evgeny Kindinov, Elena Tsyplovskaya and others. **TV premiere: January 12, 1981.**

Evgeny Tatarsky (1938–2015) known primarily for his television films with Oleg Dal in the lead roles – "Golden Mine" and "Adventures of Prince Florizel". In total, the director has 14 full-length feature films and TV series.

As film critic Lydia Maslova notes, the film "Adventures of Prince Florizel" has a well-deserved fame as one of the main "Lenfilm" TV hits, effortlessly combining classic lines of English cut and frivolous accessories, reverence for the genre of costume adaptation and ironic play with it" (Maslova, 2001).

In my opinion, film critic Alexander Sedov is right when he writes that in "Adventure of Prince Florizel" "acquired not only flesh and blood, but also the character of Oleg Dal. From a plump, not a young gentleman, as Stevenson portrayed him, he turned into a graceful, slender, more young than middle-aged prince. A nerve spring pulsed in his character, which, judging by the book prince, who looked like a cake, was hard to guess" (Sedov, 2016). At the same time, the fate of Florizel was not cloudless. The original title of the film "Suicide Club, or the Adventures of a Titled Person" was considered inappropriate by the management. The name jarred on the rumor: developed socialism and the suicide club were incompatible. But most of all, it was not the words that frightened, but the shrillness with which Oleg Dal played the royal rake. In the look, in the voice, in the manner of the fairy-tale prince, there was something too caustic, independent and clearly frontier. In the finished film, the director was asked to "soften the general intonation" (Sedov, 2016).

On the whole, one cannot but admit that "Adventures of Prince Florizel" "turned out to be stylish, ironic, and at times parody. It was a sophisticated detective-genre game designed to appeal to both the "flood" and the general public.

They say that the perfectionist Oleg Dal (1941–1981) did not like much in this picture, but one should not forget that the artistic criteria of this outstanding actor have always been very high. And the very fact that Dal did not leave the set (as it happened to him, as you know, happened), suggests that, in general, he liked the role of Prince Florizel...

This movie still has many fans today:

"For all its outward frivolity, Florizel is much deeper than many "serious" films, for without pathos and pretensions to meaningfulness, it speaks in a light ironic form about eternal (one might say, biblical truths), and Stevenson's prose, directed by Tatarsky, play almost everything without exception, actors and I. Dmitriev's inimitable offscreen comments are stylistically so complimentary to each other that, it seems, not the will of a particular person, but some kind of higher matter united them in one picture. Thanks to the talented St. Petersburg director for giving Oleg the opportunity to play this role at the end of his life, and we will once again enjoy the Dal, whom we remember from his early film roles, from Kosheverova's fairy tales and from theatrical and television works" (Evgeny G.).

"I love this movie! A wonderful duet by Oleg Dal and Igor Dmitriev. ... The film is far from the original, which I have reread many times, but I have watched the movie an uncountable number of times. I recommend to everyone a very, very good film" (Ulyana).

Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn. USSR, 1981. Director and screenwriter Stanislav Govorukhin (based on the novel by Mark Twain). Actors: Fyodor Stukov, Vladislav Galkin, Maria Mironova, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Valentina Shendrikova, Behaylu Mengesha, Vladimir Konkin, Valery Rubinchik, Vsevolod Abdulov, Rolan Bykov, Victor Pavlov, Talgat Nigmatulin, Fedor Odinokov, Boris Zaydenberg, Lev Perfilov and others. **Premiere on TV: March 27, 1982.**

Stanislav Govorukhin (1936–2018) directed two dozen feature films, of which at least six were included in the thousand of the most popular films of the USSR.

Film critic Lilia Tsibizova believes that in "Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn", "the director's picture of the world is full of optimism. The heroes of the film turned out to be much younger than their literary prototypes. Their life, in fact, has become a kind of standard of a happy childhood in a happy country, where if there is evil, it is only to show how great and inexhaustible the world of good is" (Tsibizova, 2010: 127).

Viewers' opinions about this film adaptation largely depended and depend on the comparison of the screen version with the prose of Mark Twain. Ardent supporters of literary primary sources, as a rule, do not like S. Govorukhin's film. But many viewers who are more tolerant of film adaptations still like this TV movie:

"The best film adaptation of a book by Mark Twain. All the rest seemed boring to me. ... A real children's film. As a child, I just adored him. I remember when I first watched it I was amazed: such a hit with an actor for the role of Tom. When I read the book (and I read it before watching the film), I imagined a boy very similar to Fedya Stukov. His resemblance to what I imagined when reading Tom's book struck me. Guess the director and Huck. Vladislav Galkin did an excellent job with the role. He turned out to be a real Huck, exactly as I imagined him, reading the novel. So wise in life, already full of skepticism. In general, a child deprived of childhood, which was Huck in the book. And most importantly, the film is imbued with a creative spirit. It can be seen that real artists worked on its creation, and not simple artisans, for whom the primary task is to accurately copy the original. That is why the film is so exciting and does not let go until the very end" (Turquoise).

"The film is very childish. It is very difficult for an adult with a fine artistic taste to take it seriously. With his childish pretentiousness, he leaves a painful and unpleasant impression of cloying, sugary. Many actors are terribly overacting, apparently believing that this is just right for children, it is clearer for them. And the director is good if he let them. For example, in the very first episode, when Aunt Polly talks to herself about Tom's antics, it seems that she is reading from the text, as if in a bad theatrical production. Or when the teacher catches Tom and Joe playing with the beetle and begins to beat them with a rod – how awkwardly done, terribly awkward, tense and awkward! And so in many, many episodes and dialogues throughout the film. Although Tom and Huck are generally quite well done, from time to time in their remarks some kind of strain is also felt. ... Bykov once said: for children it is necessary to shoot like for adults, only better. The creators of this film, the director and the actors, did the opposite – and it turned out worse" (Peter).

Ah, Vaudeville, Vaudeville. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Georgy Yungvald – Khilkevich (based on P. Grigoriev's vaudeville "The Daughter of a Russian Actor"). Actors: Galina Belyaeva, Mikhail Pugovkin, Oleg Tabakov, Lyudmila Krylova, etc. **Premiere on TV January 6, 1980.**

Georgy Yungvald–Khilkevich (1934–2015) directed 22 full-length feature films and is known to the audience for his "musketeer" movies, but his television "Ah, Vaudeville, Vaudeville..." was also a success.

In my opinion, the television musical "Ah, Vaudeville, Vaudeville..." was remembered by the audience, first of all, for the hits of Maxim Dunaevsky, the vocals of Zhanna Rozhdestvenskaya and the charming play of young Galina Belyaeva, who played the role of the daughter of an old actor who decided to leave the stage. At one time they liked to show this picture on New Year's Eve: at that time there was a desperate lack of entertainment programs, and the film by Georgy Yungvald–Khilkevich, modest in its artistic merit, was a good competitor to the sweetest dish of the then New Year's and Christmas nights – "Melodies and rhythms of foreign stage".

However, many viewers like this movie of Georgy Yungvald–Khilkevich even today:

"A very enjoyable musical! Tabakov is brilliant in the role of a stupid soldier, however, he shines everywhere, even with voice acting, the talent of this actor is limitless. Pugovkin is charm and charm itself, but this actor cannot cause disgust, even playing villains... Belyaeva draws out her role with the freshness of youth, the charm of the dance and a breathtaking figure... But on the whole, the film is very worthy, the main thing is that there is not an ounce of vulgarity in it. I watch and enjoy" (Iris).

"What great songs! One is better than the other. And not just la–la trulya–la, but everything with meaning... Moreover, I don't remember the plot at all, and I didn't really understand it before, but the songs remained in my head forever. All the same, Maxim Dunaevsky is a fine fellow" (V. Ivanov).

All the King's Men. USSR, 1971. Directed by Alexander Gutkovich, Naum Ardashnikov. Screenwriter Alexander Gutkovich (based on the novel by Robert P. Warren). Actors: Georgy Zhzhonov, Mikhail Kozakov, Tatiana Lavrova, Boris Ivanov, Alla Demidova, Oleg Efremov, Alexandra Klimova, Anatoly Papanov, Rostislav Plyatt, Valentina Kalinina, Valery Khlevinsky, Lev Durov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Ada Voytsik, Laimonas Noreika and others. **Premiere on TV: 28 August 1971.**

Alexander Gutkovich (1920–1989) directed two films and several television plays, but his most famous work was the television movie "All the King's Men".

Naum Ardashnikov (1931–2012) directed six full-length feature films, of which the most famous is the film "I Came and I Say", which was included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

The history of the creation of the TV movie "All the King's Men" is very dramatic.

Script based on the sensational political novel by R.P. Warren (1905–1989) was written by director Alexander Gutkovich, who invited the outstanding actor Pavel Luspekaev (1927–1970) to play the lead role of the American politician Willie Stark. P. Luspekaev began acting in this film, but in the midst of filming (the third part of the material was filmed) he died from a fatal illness... Judging by the enthusiastic reviews of eyewitnesses and the surviving film fragments, this role could have become the best in Pavel Luspekaev's career ...

It was decided to continue shooting, and A. Gutkovich opted for Georgy Zhzhonov (1915–2005). Of course, his interpretation of the role of Willie Stark was different, but very interesting and bright.

However, after the filming was completed, the authorities decided to remove Alexander Gutkovich from editing and instructed one of the film's operators, Naum Ardashnikov, to do this, who was then added to the film's credits as a co-director...

The views of the 21st century viewers about the TV movie "All the King's Men" are usually positive:

"A great film with a stellar cast. ... The main characters are played superbly – and not without reason, these are the stars of the then Soviet cinema, and in the prime of their creative powers. This film is worth watching" (Nafigator).

"The novel, according to which the film is directed, has many uninteresting "lengths", philosophical digressions and is read without much pleasure. The film is made quite dynamically and looks with interest, the actors play excellently" (Voldemar).

"For that time, a very successful film, watchable and exciting. And this is the main thing for cinema. Too bad there weren't enough props. Even we, the then schoolchildren, were struck by the

fact that the heroes drive, rather, in old Soviet cars, and not American ones. And much more could be noticed. But dynamism, acting and musical accompaniment did their job" (Yuri).

"Someone reproaches the film for being ideologized, but in those days it could not have been otherwise. Now there is no ideology, but what has changed? We have come a long way from falling in love unconditionally in the United States to almost hate. Truth is always in between. Our cinema showed the West quite truthfully and accurately, and the filmmakers of the West never bothered with the truthfulness of showing the USSR and now Russia: snow, vodka, earflaps, etc. ... As for the acting, it is quite on the level. ... America is actually different, and this too" (B. Anikeev).

However, there are also audience reviews that emphasize ideological aspects:

"The ideology immediately catches the eye ... This is how the Americans were seen in the USSR, in the party and ideological leadership of the country... The transfer of action from the mid-1920s to the recent 1960s also did not justify itself; as a result, it does not correspond to either one or the other times. ... They smoke and drink all the time, seemingly to assert their American condolence. But the actors play passions, alas, exclusively in Russian, with hysterics, howling and excessive categoricity. ... The hero of Georgy Zhzhenov is trying his best to resemble John F. Kennedy with his full-face smile, but immediately turns into a "cruel unprincipled politician". All lyrical, romantic, human lines of the novel by Robert Penn Warren in the film are not just omitted, they are destroyed.... And the ideologically verified picture remained" (Dnipro).

American Tragedy. USSR, 1981. Directed by Marionas Giedris. Screenwriter Pranas Morkus (based on the novel of the same name by Theodor Dreiser). Actors: Gediminas Storpishtis, Anna Aleksakhina, Aida Zara, Regimantas Adomaitis and others. **TV premiere: October 1981.**

Marionas Giedris (1933–2011) directed 12 films and serials (including the television "American Tragedy"), but only his historical drama "Herkus Mantas" managed to enter the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films in the box office.

Audiences tend to diverge about "American Tragedy".

The main arguments of the opponents are the differences from the plot of Theodor Dreiser's novel, which, from their point of view, spoiled this TV movie:

"A very, very mediocre film adaptation. I saw the film twice and was deeply disappointed both times. The lifelessness of the characters and the action are the main features of the film" (N. Seregina).

"A rather mediocre film adaptation of the novel by T. Dreiser. You can't compare with a book. The impression is aggravated by nondescript actresses. Dreiser's representatives of the secular society are all pretty, and Sondra Finchley should be just a doll. Although in the film Aleksakhina is certainly brighter than the faceless Lithuanian actresses. Perhaps only Griffiths matches the image" (Alena).

But there are, of course, enthusiastic responses:

"I watched this film with pleasure, the production is really wonderful, I would even call it flawless. But what surprised me was that the film looks very modern, as if it had been filmed only yesterday. But it was created in an era of terry stagnation, and it would not be surprising if it showed American life in a very critical way. However, the director Marionas Giedris draws more on the life, feelings, relationships and characters of people, and does it with mean, but expressive means. ... Lithuanian actors are very convincing ... A great film, just a wonderful production, you won't see such films now. I got a real pleasure from watching" (Esmeralda).

"I liked the film very much. It seemed to me that the director took the film adaptation seriously. And the work of all the actors is conscientious" (Novikova).

"This is truly a classic movie. ... Love! Every time I look anew with great pleasure!" (Evladika).

Personally, I am more inclined to support positive opinions of the audience. In my opinion, Marionas Gedris thoughtfully transferred T. Dreiser's prose to the TV screen...

And It's All about Him. USSR, 1978. Directed by Igor Shatrov. Screenwriter Vil Lipatov (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Evgeny Leonov, Igor Kostolevsky, Leonid Markov, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Larisa Udovichenko, Vladimir Nosik, Alexey Pankin, Victor Proskurin, Alexander Kavalero, Lyubov Polekhina, Lyudmila Chursina, Nikolai Parfyonov, Albert Filozov, Yuri Kayurov, Boris Gusina and others. **Premiere on TV: March 24, 1978.**

Igor Shatrov (1918–1991) directed 7 films (including "Male Talk" and "Closing the Season"), but perhaps his most famous work was the detective series "And It's All about Him."

In the psychological detective story "And It's All about Him" a brilliant acting ensemble was assembled, but nevertheless Igor Shatrov made the main bet on the extremely popular film "The Star of Captivating Happiness" by the young actor Igor Kostolevsky after the release. And he made the right decision – millions of viewers (especially female spectators), holding their breath, sat for six evenings at home screens...

Here are some quotes from typical audience reviews:

"I remember writing an essay on the topic "My Favorite Film" at school. As a favorite film I chose "And it's all about him" – it was then just shown on TV. The film really made a strong impression on me. Of course, three lines are clearly traced in the film: ideological (where can we go without it?), detective (it is necessary to support the audience's interest) and love; the truth is, I would not call the love line clear: rather, it appears in the film as a kind of beautiful supplement to the main, ideological, meaning of the film. But these three things weren't the reason the film captured me. The most interesting thing is human characters, relationships, clashes of these characters – in a word, the most interesting are people" (Lyudmila).

"This film touches me for the soul. ... Handsome, young, interesting, funny, charming, with a charming smile, with balloons, so ideological, energetic, not boring. They are a beautiful couple. He liked her so much, he loved her. And now he's gone. And it never will. And in her eyes there is emptiness and longing. ... And I am sincerely sorry that such an irreparable tragedy happened" (Natasha).

"We even learned the song from the picture about "An alder earring, as light as down", in the guitar class, and with pleasure. Of course, in some ways this work is "ideologically consistent", but somehow it did not interfere. And the actors in the film are very good. Yes, and there is a love line there, and not only "production–Komsomol". And from the detective genre it was added quite successfully – at first you think that Stoletov was killed, and then it turns out to be just an accident" (M. Morozova).

But, of course, the film could not captivate the hearts of all viewers: "At school we were forced to read this work, terribly dull, according to the curriculum. Then there was a discussion of the image of the Komsomol member Yevgeny Stoletov. Such dregs... The film is very protracted, and the actors, as it were, do not play roles, but torture them" (J. Medvedeva).

Bat. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Jan Fried (based on the libretto by Nikolai Erdman and Mikhail Volpin and the operetta of the same name Johann Strauss). Actors: Yuri Solomin, Lyudmila Maksakova, Larisa Udovichenko, Vitaly Solomin, Oleg Vidov, Igor Dmitriev, Yuri Vasiliev, Evgeny Vesnik, Glikeria Bogdanova–Chesnokova, Olga Volkova, Sergei Filippov, Ivan Lyubeznov, Alexander Demyanenko and others. **TV premiere on March 4 1979.**

Jan Fried (1908–2003) directed 16 full-length films, five of which ("Lyubov Yarovaya", "Twelfth Night", "Another's Trouble", "Green Carriage", "Farewell to St. Petersburg") in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films. For most of his life, Jan Fried has screened classical plays and operettas. He worked in television for a significant part of his life. The adaptation of the operetta "Bat" is one of his most famous television works.

Film critic Mikhail Ivanov wrote that in Jan Fried's "Bat", "the production itself, the play of all the actors (especially the brothers) is beyond praise, but I would especially like to highlight the witty dialogues. The picture just looks with pleasure, even if you are not a Strauss fan and don't like musicals in general" (Ivanov, 2001).

Indeed, the play of Yuri and Vitaly Solomin, in my opinion, is admirable. They play lightly, brightly and with visible pleasure plunge into the elements of the operetta "aristocratic–bourgeois" life and love misunderstandings...

Today's viewers usually like "Bat", although many of them have complaints about Lyudmila Maksakova's performance:

"Wonderful, bewitching, touching, romantic and funny operetta. The cast is remarkably well chosen: Yu. Solomin, L. Maksakova, V. Solomin, L. Udovichenko and others. Actors play in one breath" (Ioanna).

"A masterpiece in the genre of operetta! Against the backdrop of the disgusting modern cinema, it is a real pleasure to watch this film. The actors are incomparable" (Ilya).

"I just love this amazing movie. Lyudmila Maksakova! I love all of her roles. And my favorite role in this film... I have always loved, I love operetta. ... A very funny, interesting story. I am delighted with the film, I simply cannot convey it" (Valera).

"The operetta "Bat" itself is a masterpiece of masterpieces... The film is wonderful: costumes, scenery, direction. But this film has one drawback – the main character. Well, Maksakov doesn't pull in any way... Not only is she clearly too old for this role, but in the first episode she has some kind of stupid expression on her face... She does not look next to Yuri Solomin" (Maryam).

"I also don't like Maksakova in this film. Not only is she a little old, but she doesn't play well. Sorry for the pun. Most of all in this film I like the pair Vitaly Solomin – Larisa Udovichenko. Look great together. ... If we talk about all the adaptations of the famous operettas in the 1970s and 1980s, this is the best one" (N. Volkova).

Battalions are Asking for Fire. USSR, 1985. Alexander Bogolyubov, Vladimir Chebotarev. Screenwriters Yuri Bondarev, Alexander Bogolyubov (based on the story of the same name by Yuri Bondarev). Actors: Alexander Zbruev, Vadim Spiridonov, Oleg Efremov, Alexander Galibin, Elena Popova, Igor Sklyar, Vladimir Kashpur, Nikolay Karachentsov, Vyacheslav Baranov, Borislav Brondukov, Alexander Feklistov, Vadim Andreev and others. **TV premiere – February 1985.**

Vladimir Chebotarev (1921–2010) directed 16 films, four of which ("Amphibian Man", "Collapse", etc.) were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films.

Alexander Bogolyubov (1934–2020) started his career in cartoon films, and then directed two feature films, of which the most famous was the drama "Battalions are Asking for Fire."

The military drama "Battalions are Asking for Fire" was intended for television and did not go to film distribution, but the directors filmed it as for the big screen, without any discounts on television specifics.

In my opinion, this is one of the best adaptations of Yuri Bondarev's prose. Thank God, there are no edifying parallels with the present, no contrasts of the Western world, no tiresome monologues by prominent artists who remember their front–line youth. "Battalions are Asking for Fire" is a film only about the Great Patriotic War. With a strong direction, with good acting work (I would especially like to highlight Alexander Zbruev and Igor Sklyar).

The crossing of the Dnieper is shown in "Battalions..." without any heroic pathos. For the characters in the film, it's just hard work that they don't like, which, nevertheless, must be done at all costs.

Andrey Petrov wrote a wonderful song for the film. In the courageous, quiet performance of Nikolai Karachentsov, it sounds heartfelt and sad...

As A. Muradov and K. Shergova wrote, "we have an interesting dramatic solution – the creation of a separate conflict within this extended exposition. In order for the viewer to experience all the drama that constitutes the plot basis of the film, the authors did more than just present the heroes – they created a separate work inside the exhibition with the so–called love triangle and other human experiences. This made it possible to simultaneously solve two tasks in this way: preparing the viewer for the drama that will unfold in the finale, while ensuring maximum empathy, and showing the participants as living people with their passions and daily experiences

opposed to military actions. It is military action that is the basis of the plot structure. ... On the other hand, this picture, albeit in hints and secondary lines, offered to a certain extent a new look at the events of those years. ... Here we see a hint of a humanistic approach, in which the value of an individual human life is opposed to strategic tasks ... and various episodes, the meaning of which is to convey the facts and spirit of that time revealed in recent years just as much as the current situation allowed, but still say a little more than it was possible before. In this case, we mean not only the various everyday details of the life of those whose houses were seized by the Germans, or the career ambitions of some characters who exposed their comrades to attack. ... Such ambiguity as the main storyline will become a dramatic move in later, that is, post-Soviet multi-part films" (Muradov, Shergova, 2019: 79, 82–83).

21st century viewers rate this war drama very highly:

"This film is the best about the war. I like it much more than the pathetic "Hot Snow" or Ozerov's films. The actors play incredibly" (Andrey).

"Very good work! And actors, directors, and screenwriters. Very close to the book. In addition, this is one of those, unfortunately not often encountered, cases when a film is no worse than a book. Stunningly strong performance of their roles by the actors... I would put this film on a par with such masterpieces as "Checking on the Roads", "Only "old men" go to battle, "Hot Snow" – no doubt the best films about the war" (Timur).

Big Break. USSR, 1973. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Scriptwriters Alexey Korenev, Georgy Sadovnikov (based on G. Sadovnikov's story "I go to the people"). Actors: Mikhail Kononov, Evgeny Leonov, Rolan Bykov, Alexander Zbruev, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Yuri Kuzmenkov, Savely Kramarov, Natalia Bogunova, Natalia Gvozdikova, Victor Proskurin, Valery Nosik, Nina Maslova, Irina Azer, Lyudmila Kasatkina and others. **Premiere on TV: April 29, 1973.**

Alexey Korenev (1927–1995) directed 13 films. These are mainly comedies, among which there are, in my opinion, very successful ones ("Literature Lesson", "Big Break", "For Family Circumstances").

The story of the creation of this legendary comedy itself can be a "plot for a short story": such actors as Andrei Myagkov and Konstantin Raikin auditioned for the main role of an evening school teacher. And Mikhail Kononov (1940–2007), who eventually played the main role – the young teacher Nestor Petrovich – was very skeptical about his role...

At one time, the film press reacted to the "Big Break" rather harshly, claiming, for example, that "a strange hero was walking on the TV screen. Ridiculously eccentric. Every now and then he finds himself in situations that cause awkwardness. Extremely self-confident and incomprehensibly narcissistic. The hero's profession was a teacher, and he fell asleep in class, fussed a lot, intrusively climbed into people's souls, demonstrating a complete inability to navigate in space and situations, in a word, caused vague associations with an elephant in a china shop – in the same way he produced numerous destruction and in the same way there was an unbearable amount of it. The qualities of the hero, nevertheless, evoked in the authors what they call a "kind smile." There is eccentricism and eccentricism. In this case, the absurdity of the character's behavior had no parallels in life-it was simply that our attention for four nights in a row was attempted to be held on an unsympathetic weirdo, chaotic and uncontrollable, and therefore not an embodiment of any laws of life, nothing worth pondering" (Labkovskaya, 1973).

And the head teacher of the 192nd Moscow evening school S. Myagchenkov strictly wrote in the "Teachers' Newspaper" that "Big Break" "falls short of many requirements. The whole thing, I think, is in the quality of humor, the comedy itself. Comedy can only be judged from the standpoint of comedy. Apparently, the very intention to solve complex problems of the school with comedic means is not entirely consistent. ... The script for "Big Breake" is very vulnerable, scenes and events are scattered, the film is kaleidoscopic, due to which comedic situations often look like violence against the truth. Comedy situations, as a rule, are based on hyperboles (Nestor Petrovich's dream, the rescue of a "drowning" teacher, the notorious call, etc.), which, in fact, give off far-fetchedness. Hyperbolization is more characteristic of the parody genre, so it is no coincidence that many

viewers perceived the TV movie not as comedy, but as a parody. Parody is supported by a general tonality, slipping caustic mockery, a touch of caricature" (Myagchenkov, 1973).

The teachers of the 1970s were also outraged, believing that "with the price of "Big Break" is very vulnerable, the scenes and events are scattered, the film is kaleidoscopic, due to which comedic situations often look like violence against the truth" (Myagchenkov, 1973). Myagchenkov S. From conception to execution // Teacher's Newspaper. 25.08.1973.

Veteran of the Great Patriotic War N. Poltorakov spoke in a similar vein on the pages of the newspaper "Soviet Culture": "I am writing to you under the impression of watching the new TV serial "Big Break". Perhaps it happens in life that a young teacher, entangled in his personal affairs, sleeps in class, dreams of good intentions, but in fact turns out to be unable to carry them out. Perhaps it happens. But was it worth it to turn the teacher into a kind of eccentric, who does not know how to do anything and, like a boy, reacts to all the "pranks" of his students? And they just scoff at him: one drunk climbs into the classroom window, the other yells furiously, and the third leaves the lesson ... It's a pity that all this is "worked out for humor" on the screen" (Poltorakov, 1973).

The scientist Yu. Kulozmin also remained dissatisfied with the "Big Break": "I was waiting for the appearance of the serial film on the TV screen with great interest. I thought: what a fertile material for a cheerful, intelligent comedy – a young inexperienced teacher and a class of over-grown students, good production workers, friendly and kind guys and girls, sometimes behaving in this school like boys and girls. But the last, fourth series has passed. And it turned out: there is no real working youth in the film, and there is no craving for knowledge. ... Teachers are also matched to the students in the film. ... It became annoying for the great comedic actors (as always, E. Leonov is inimitable), who were forced to waste their talent" (Kulozmin, 1973).

Against this background, the opinion of the film critic Anna Kagarlitskaya looked like a dissonance, who believed that "the art of Mikhail Kononov is always beyond the scope of the role, genre, and style. He destroys the role – and the scoundrel turns out to be an unhappy person, he breaks the boundaries of the genre – and a harmless joke turns into a tragedy. A similar metamorphosis did not escape the television film "Big Break", where Kononov played the main role of the evening school teacher Nestor Severov. Everyone here has a lot of fun – and the numerous students of the protagonist, and his fiancée, and other characters densely populating the picture. Everyone, except for Nestor Severov himself – Mikhail Kononov. At other moments in the actor's play, one can record attempts at rebellion, the whole ultra-comedy world of the picture is so alien to his nature (where, we note, humor is almost the main place). However, this rebellion, already timid and lonely, every time it is successfully suppressed – by the director, partners, drama. And then the actor remembers the old mask – that's where he finally came in handy. Just as in the old days the unlucky Fool emerged victorious, so now the ridiculous, dreamy Nestor, through the efforts of the actor, eventually rises above the bustle of universal senseless fun" (Kagarlitskaya, 1982).

In the 1990s and in the 21st century, the attitude of film critics to "Big Break" changed quite radically.

So the film critic Alexander Shpagin was convinced that "Big Break" is a unique film: Have you seen at least one other multi-part storyless comedy film? Moreover, it is funny, funny? I bet not. This is the secret of success. But not only. In "Big Break" we see a kind of happy and stable world. But at the same time, he is amazingly funny. And for good reason. Of course, if you work for a certain myth (in this case, the myth of the beautiful Soviet life), then it is better to present it through comedic twists and turns. And joke a little. The effect will be twice as strong. But there is something more valuable about "Big Break". From the very first shots, we see that in this happy paradise everyone is out of place. Moreover, totally. The gifted historian Severov is forced to become a school teacher, his fiancée goes to graduate school instead of him and does not become a wife any more, adult men studying at night school, inevitably find themselves in the position of naughty children and so on. But everything seems to be fine – and the sun is shining, and everyone is smiling, and in general nothing sad happens. Only now this world will not rise from head to foot.

The film also has a third secret – it is emphatically reprisal. Each scene is a complete sketch with a beginning, development and ending. And where there ... "Tavern "13 chairs", so beloved in those years. There is a frozen form of a monthly television program, here is perpetual motion, here

are characters, here is a movie. It is a perpetual motion in place. Not a single conflict has been resolved here, not a single knot has been untied. Here, it would seem, a little more, just about, and... – no, it is not untied. Instead of the longed-for denouement – another effect of a sitcom, another trick, another game. ... And here is the paradox of the film. Nobody succeeds here, but it seems that the opposite is true. What's the matter? In an intonation that radiates not strained optimism, but the energy of the frank joy of being. How good it turns out how fun it is to live in such a carnival, how interesting it is to feel out of place! Moreover, you can always go back. ... In short, the game. A game with no winners. All won. And nobody. Friendship won. In those years, there were no winners in life either. The team won. The dullness of being won. And people who occupied other people's places prevented others from living. And the insanity grew stronger. And here, in "Big Break", all this bad absurdity of the stagnant world... is brought to public display, but with the opposite sign. Plus sign. It turns out that you can live, and how! – reviving the spirit of the past, live free and fun. There are still no allusions and figs in pockets, all hits here are only at the subconscious level. Laugh and console yourself. No need to think about it. But great success makes one think inevitably. And it turns out that all the clichés and patterns of being can become a guarantee of freedom, if you look at them from the other side, if you approach them creatively. First you need to step back and find your own view of things. How simple. And what is it? Comfort? Advice? Looking for a way out?" (Shpagin, 1996).

And scholar Yulia Mikheeva assured readers that "in A. Korenev's film "Big Break", the teacher Nestor Petrovich Severov (Mikhail Kononov) simply had to become comical, because the dramatic pathos of the 60s had already become impossible. Impossible in the adequacy of perception, although poorly hidden pathos appears physically in later paintings. ... In "Big Break"... the authors did not approach the topic from the front porch. And not even from the side entrance. They just boyishly climbed into the school window... Everything turns upside down here. Adult students, the Severov history teacher, hurt by life (like the "historian" Melnikov, and in the same 9th grade!) With his parody-poster love for a woman ("Let me admire you. I watched you for seven days and came to the conclusion that you deserve me"). Working at school for him is a voluntary penance, although Nestor speaks of her as a vocation, which he simply did not suspect in his "past" life... And Nestor's irritability is now not a manifestation of an "internal tuning fork", but a reaction to the attempt, as it seems to him, to the "greatness" of his personality... Is it possible to imagine that Melnikov shouted at his students: "Stand up when you talk to the teacher!" – How did Severov do it? And what a parody the roll call of the themes of the compositions from two films looks like: "My idea of happiness" (in "We'll Live Until Monday") and "Whom I Want to Be Like" (in "Big Break") – and, accordingly, the students' answers: "Happiness is this is when you are understood" (establishing a connection with another) and "I want to be like only myself" (breaking the connection with another, protest). In the first case, Melnikov's reaction brings this phrase to the worldview level for a whole generation. In the second case, Nestor, as it should be in a movie "overturning" the theme, manifests himself as a teacher from the worst side: puts Ganja a "stake" and returns the notebook with an angry exclamation: "Get it!"

The most important thing in this transition of the teacher's theme to the field of the comic is the conclusion of the entire film in the framework of a conditional, at times frankly kitsch game of teachers and students. To overcome the pathos of a school movie of the 1960s, comedy had to go to the other extreme – kitsch (just as the fashion for mini 1960s rapidly changed to maxi in the 1970s. And then jeans canceled fashion). What promises to eternity can we talk about now? This game is perceived by the viewer naturally, as an idealized, rustic, sometimes even silly, but not boring (=fake) action. And here's what is important: in spite of the essence of this game of teaching that "diminishes" (if not derogatory) the image of the teacher, the very fact of its appearance testifies to the same tendency to move away from straightforward statements from the screen. The calculation is made on over-understanding, the detached smile of the viewer. It is no longer possible to take sermons seriously in the style of Melnikov's teacher, so Severov, for all his contrivances, is still perceived with sympathy" (Mikheeva, 2009).

Now it is already clear that the comedy "Big Break" has stood the test of time and continues to delight not the first generation of viewers who do not try to look for everyday school truth in the comedy plot, but enjoy the play of wonderful actors and a scattering of lyrical and humorous situations, skillfully directed by Alexei Korenev:

"Great Film! A brilliant director – Alexey Korenev! Great script! Impeccable selection of actors! No one will ever repeat the success of "Big Break" – a multi-part film about "life, work, study and love!" (S. Korshak).

"Kind, family, home cinema. A film where you don't laugh so much as you relax. And the eye rejoices and the soul sings. A brilliant combination of veterans of the stage and very young yesterday's students of theater universities. The cast is incomparable" (Andrey).

"A very good and really kind film... And the actors are just a scattering of gems. ... Yes, there was a time when such a wonderful movie was shot!" (Efrata).

But even today there are audience reviews, akin to the criticism of the 1970s:

"I don't like the film, especially M. Kononov (both as an actor and as a "hero"). ... Everything is a lie, stupidity... Even the film "Give a Book of Complaints" for all its emptiness is still not as wretched as "Big Break", and there is nothing to say about humor" (Third Party).

Bonivour's Heart. USSR, 1969. Directed by Mark Orlov. Screenwriter Andrei Shemshurin (based on the novel of the same name by Dmitry Nagishkin). Actors: Lev Prygunov, Boris Chirkov, Tamara Korolyuk, Ivan Pereverzev, Victor Korshunov, Pyotr Glebov, Maya Bulgakov and others. **TV premiere: October 21, 1969.**

Mark Orlov (1925–2000) directed two dozen television films and serials, among which the most famous were "Bonivour's Heart" and "Petersburg Secrets".

The television movie "Bonivour's Heart" was filmed as part of the adventure "historical and revolutionary theme", where ideological accents were placed clearly and clearly, and Bonivour himself, performed by the charming Lev Prygunov, was shown as an ideal positive hero fighting the enemies of no less positive Bolsheviks.

There are a lot of fans of "Bonivour's Heart" even today:

"One of my favorite films! It has not been shown on our television for a long time, probably not those times now, but it's a pity I would have watched with pleasure this amazing film to the core, with the participation of a wonderful actor L. Prygunov in the role of Bonivour! In a word, the Classics of Soviet cinema!" (Alexander).

"I watched this film in my distant childhood, a very interesting film, excellent acting, really – the stars play naturally" (Vladimir).

But this movie has a lot of opponents:

"Yeah, we watched it all. And only today do you learn that Bonivour was an ordinary bandyugan hired by the Bolsheviks to establish Soviet power in the Far East. An ordinary criminal who rampaged with his brothers" (Alden).

"I probably won't be able to watch this film anymore because of the interview I read by Prygunov "I was an ardent anti-Soviet". As a child, I remember, this film made a great impression – I sobbed bitterly at the end and then dreamed of revising everything. And after this interview, I'm afraid, I will see on the screen not the brave Bonivour, but the actor Lev Prygunov, who hates his hero in his soul and makes fun of him" (Elle).

Born by the Revolution. USSR, 1974–1977. Directed by Grigory Kokhan. Screenwriters Geliy Ryabov, Alexey Nagorny. Actors: Evgeny Zharikov, Natalia Gvozdikova, Victor Shulgin, Vadim Medvedev, Uldis Pucitis, Lev Prygunov, Alexander Yanvaryov, Vladimir Talashko, Ernst Romanov, Alexander Khochinsky, Evgeny Leonov–Gladyshev, Alexander Filippenko, Alexander Belyavsky and others. **TV premiere (first series): November 10, 1974.**

Grigory Kokhan (1931–2014) best known for his TV series "Born by the Revolution". In total, he has 14 films and TV series, of which only the historical drama "Yaroslav the Wise" managed to enter the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

The scriptwriters of the series "State Border" Geliy Ryabov (1932–2015) and Alexei Nagorny (1922–1984) this time wrote a story about the Soviet militia unfolded over decades. This film also

starred very famous actors and, in fact, became a Soviet telegym in honor of those whose "service is both dangerous and difficult..."

A year after the premiere of this film, film critic Yuri Bogomolov wrote that "perhaps the least interesting in a purely plot sense, and perhaps in the director's incarnation, is the first episode, which tells how a very young guy comes from a village to Petrograd, gets to Putilovsky the factory, and then, together with other most class-conscious workers, goes to the "threat". There is essentially no detective intrigue here, and the motive for the growth of the guy's consciousness is too inexpressive, traditional, and finally, just quotation. It must be said that in general the episodes concerning the circumstances of ideological maturation, civic maturation, seem unconvincing. ... The main character is enclosed in the event, like a picture in a frame. It reacts and moves on the screen, but internally remains motionless. Ideally very important, the topic of opposing the methods and means of the tsarist criminal police and the people's militia born by the revolution has not been completely resolved consistently. Although it is stated directly and sharply. For example, a former officer of the tsarist criminal police, Kolychev, who is quite loyal to the Soviet regime, explains to young police officers that in the old days they fought crime with the help of the criminals themselves: some repeat offenders pointed at others. Nikolai Kondratyev and his comrades decide to rely in their craft only on the help of honest people" (Bogomolov, 1975: 2–3).

The opinions of today's viewers of "Born by the Revolution" can be clearly divided into those where the approval of the interpretation of historical events in the spirit of communist ideology initially appears and those who consider these movies to be stereotypical attempts to varnish "the affairs of bygone days":

"The correct and necessary picture. And the work of the police officers was not so embellished here, people helped the police then, maybe because they were cleaner and more human. After all, for some three years after the civil war, crime and homelessness decreased by almost 90%, and what kind of banditry was there after the Great Patriotic War, and who eliminated it? Great movie! How many young people, having watched this film, became police officers!" (Camo).

"The film, like the book, is overfilled with ideology. This is its big minus, because it is outdated and nowadays not relevant. Is that as a film illustration of the trends of the time. It is not based on any real facts. For example, the authors turned the story of Lyonka Panteleev in their own way for the sake of ideology. In reality, everything was different. ... And so... not heroes, but solid stands. They express themselves purely in the language of revolutionary pathos. The authors went too far with this – a fact" (Angry).

Bumbarash. USSR, 1971. Directed by Nikolai Rasheev, Abram (Arkady) Naroditsky. Screenwriter Evgeny Mitko (based on the early works of Arkady Gaidar). Actors: Valery Zolotukhin, Yuri Smirnov, Natalia Dmitrieva, Alexander Khochinsky, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Lev Durov, Roman Tkachuk and others. **TV premiere: May 1, 1972.**

Nikolay Rasheev directed nine full-length feature films (among them – "Little School Orchestra", "Kings and Cabbage", "Apple in the Palm"), but his most famous work was "Bumbarash".

Abram Naroditsky (1906–2002) directed the same number of films. "Bumbarash" was the last work in cinema, but also the most famous of his films.

This controversial adaptation of the early stories of Arkady Gaidar was greeted by the Soviet film press generally positively.

For example, in a review published in the journal "Soviet Screen" it was noted that "this is a tale, the tones and genre shades of which are constantly changing throughout the whole picture. From the outrageous soldier's stories to the past – from the popular-foolish story of the feat (for the faith, the king and the fatherland!) Bumbarash... From pure gypsy (Levkina's song) to operetta and pop (ataman-woman). From household and military popular prints to lyrical popular prints. From a fairy tale to life, genuine and genuine. ... One can envy V. Zolotukhin and be happy for him: he got a great role, there is where to turn around. And he really turned around. He creates an image almost on a folklore level... Of course, only an actor of a talent, rare in its spontaneity, depth and

authenticity, could have played such a Bumbarash. It is such an actor, deep and amazing, that V. Zolotukhin. ... The role of the ataman-woman (perfectly played and "sung" by E. Vasilyeva) with her neurasthenic artistry, with her playing in the half-light diva, a kind of cancan operetta queen of a short but bloody bandit "kingdom-state" (Nedelin, 1972 : 2–13).

The opinions of 21st century viewers about Bumbarash today differ significantly:

"Even as a child, when I watched "Bumbarash", I was constantly struck by some discrepancy. Why doesn't the hero run headlong into the Red Army? Why is the most unsympathetic character in the film – the red commander Zaplatin (Roman Tkachuk)? Why are the obvious villains so humanly convincing – Gavril, Sofya Nikolaevna, the miller? Why pity them when they die, even Gavril? Now, revisiting "Bumbarash" already in adulthood, you see that this film is perhaps the best one about the civil war. Not from the point of view of the notorious "historical truth", but as a look at an era when everything stood on end and upside down. The theater of the absurd... Bumbarash is dead, because "the money has been paid for the requiem" ... The bath of the "St. Petersburg's "star" in the forest, surrounded by bandits... Gavril's estate, lined with statues... His servants - a student reading French poetry, a painter from the Academy of Arts... Gavril himself with a book from the life of kings... And the main symbol – the crossroads of steppe roads, on which the mounted detachment of Zaplatin, Gavril's gang, the Markov White Guards are rushing here and there, not paying attention to each other... And between them – the unhappy Bumbarash, who has lost everything – his beloved, his home, his brother, his friends... And even his enemies" (M. Kirillov).

"I didn't like Bumbarash. Valery Zolotukhin is not my favorite actor, although Alexander Khochinsky, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Yuri Smirnov is wonderful" (Valera).

Of course, the work of Valery Zolotukhin can be treated in different ways. But, in my opinion, Bumbarash is his best film role...

Captain Nemo. USSR, 1975. Directed by Vasily Levin. Screenwriters Vasily Levin, Edgar Smirnov (based on the novels by Jules Verne "20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" and "The Steam House"). Actors: Vladislav Dvorzhetsky, Yuri Rodionov, Mikhail Kononov, Vladimir Talashko, Marianna Vertinskaya, Vladimir Basov, Gennady Nilov, Alexander Porokhovshchikov and others.
TV premiere: March 29, 1976.

Vasily Levin (1923–1998) directed ten full-length feature films, two of which ("The Tale of First Love" and "Stratton's Daughter") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films. But the main and most popular work of Vasily Levin was the television movie "Captain Nemo" with Vladislav Dvorzhetsky.

The television movie "Captain Nemo" was originally planned to be shot for a children's audience, but in the end this picture became interesting for adults as well. Largely because of the leading actor – Vladislav Dvorzhetsky (1939–1978). His acting magic attracted the audience's gaze, his human significance, depth very well coincided with the image of the legendary Captain Nemo, whose adventures have been read for several generations...

But at first Mikhail Kazakov (1934–2011) auditioned for the role of Captain Nemo (and quite successfully). But in the end, director Vasily Levin chose Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. And I think I was right, the film "Captain Nemo" and today has a huge number of fans among viewers of different ages...

Of course, someone is embarrassed today in this film by the lack of special effects usual in the 21st century, someone is dissatisfied with the level of acting of some performers. Some, but not Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. This outstanding master, by his very presence, could raise the artistic level of almost any film.

Frankly, Vladislav Dvorzhetsky was and remains one of my favorite actors. I was lucky, I twice attended his creative meetings and listened with admiration to his stories about filming films, about his favorite roles and directors...

Already in the 21st century, film critic Yulia Ulyanovskaya ironically notes that in Captain Nemo "the wardrobe of the film "Straw Hat" was clearly used to dress the actors. If I remember correctly, around that time in Soviet cinema there was a fashion for musicals, and they always sang

in all films. Since "Captain Nemo" was made with a pretense, and besides, it was about war and the ideals of good, neither the professor, nor the captain, nor the harpooner sing themselves (it would look somehow ridiculous), but the songs in their lives are still present, serving as a reflection of the thought process in difficult situations. ... The funny thing is that now I am laughing at their game and at the situation in general, and seeing twenty years ago I would not have noticed anything special. ... "Captain Nemo" is all about conventions. ... But: Although the present eye is both funny and boring at the same time (and this is possible), this film adaptation, due to its conventionality, detaches from reality and carries the gullible viewer into some ordered and rather cozy space. Subordination is observed there, reason wins, the spoken words are so significant that they are almost material, the traitor and the enemy are explained and roughly punished, and help is rendered to friends – even with the last bit of strength. All this is smeared and sealed with an ideological tear about the balance of humanity and justice, and besides, it ends well. Ah, the seventy-fifth year, I did not know you at all ... Probably, it was a happy time. Now "Captain Nemo" is intended for people who watched it as a child ... and are ready for a touching attack of light sadness with hysteria in half: "Do you remember how cool it looked then?" (Ulyanovskaya, 2008).

The views of the 21st century viewers are largely confirmed by the observations of Y. Ulyanovskaya:

"This is my favorite movie. I always cry when I look... I don't care that there are no super-special effects. In such a film, they are not really needed. I can not imagine another actor in the role of Nemo except Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. Successful selection of actors" (Y. Niman).

"The film of my childhood! I still look! Very good music! I can't imagine anyone else other than Dvorzhetsky in the role of Captain Nemo. A film with meaning, makes children think and reflect. I consider it one of the best children's films" (S. Grinenko).

"Now, of course, the whole special-effect component of the film looks just with a smile... But in Soviet childhood it was a favorite film, and the holidays were not a vacation without it!" (Alexander P.).

"Vladislav Dvorzhetsky is a real Captain Nemo. Such a textured appearance. The music is sad in the film, my heart aches, I want to cry. I do not like the seas and oceans, in the sense that I feel sorry for Ichthyander and Nemo, they are forced to spend their lives in this cold abyss, in this loneliness. But if about Ichthyander – a fiction, then here the background is very even true. Damned colonialists. Damned pale, eternally hungry Europeans, who dragged from other states to their stunted pages of wealth and objects of art. Moreover, they killed people who dared, you see, to resist these invaders" (Leta).

"20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" is one of my favorite pieces by Jules Verne. Therefore, I could not pass by this adaptation. ... What impressed me especially in this film was the absolutely amazing performance of Vladislav Dvorzhetsky. None of the Western performers of this role could convey the image of Captain Nemo so deeply. Although the image of Nemo in the film is still different from the original. On the one hand, he is much more human. Having gone under water, he not only rams ships, but also helps his former associates in India. At the same time, in the film, Nemo is much less emotional than in the novel ... Dvorzhetsky demonstrated not even 100, but 200 percent of his talent. Bravo! ... Well, and finally, it is worth noting the excellent musical accompaniment of the film. Each song is a separate masterpiece. Thus, despite all the differences from the original (both successful and unsuccessful), I would recommend this movie to absolutely anyone. If Jules Verne were alive, even he, I think, would have been pleased with such an adaptation of his book" (N. Volkov).

Circus Princess. USSR, 1982. Director and screenwriter Svetlana Druzhinina (based on the operetta of the same name by Imre Kalman). Actors: Natalia Belokhovostikova, Igor Keblushek, Nikolay Trofimov, Yuri Moroz, Elena Shanina, Lyudmila Kasatkina, Vladimir Basov, Alexander Shirvindt, Emmanuel Geller and others. **TV premiere: December 25, 1982.**

Director Svetlana Druzhinina staged nine films and TV series, of which the most famous are the romantic costume series about the adventures of midshipmen and the film adaptation of the operetta "Circus Princess".

Of course, on New Year's Eve 1982, the "Circus Princess" was perceived by millions of spectators not spoiled by entertainment as a luxurious gift.

However, the opinions of the audience of the 21st century, overwhelmed with spectacles, about this film are sharply divided into pros and cons.

"Pro":

"Circus Princess" is a film that I watch several times a year, but it always creates a magical mood in me, a kind of childish admiration. I want to remind you that this is an operetta and actors — dolls are quite appropriate here, and in general, one should not present such high artistic requirements to an operetta. ... "Circus Princess" is an excellent panacea for the blues!" (Ilya).

"I really liked the movie. Igor Keblushek — Mr. X. I liked it very much and stayed in my memory. ... The voices are very beautiful. Natalia Belokhvostikova is a true princess of the circus" (Valera).

"Contra":

"I didn't like the film at all. And the main character is not so handsome — in a close-up one can see terribly problematic skin, and Belokhvostikova somehow did not fit in, and Shanina, in general, does not look like a circus girl, but a girl from the panel" (Lina).

"The actors are poorly chosen, it is clear that Keblushek not only does not sing, but does not speak either. It is hard to believe that the amorphous heroine of Belokhvostikova can kindle wild passions in men" (Irina).

"I don't like the film "Circus Princess"! The choice of actors for the main roles is unfortunate. Belokhvostikova is not that old... It's just that the partner next to her is too young! Therefore, it does not look at all! ... And Keblushek is a beautiful doll that opens its mouth to the sound of someone else's performance. True, well done, he simultaneously reveals" (Helen).

"I'm afraid that the main failure of this film is the director's work. Druzhinina could not help but understand that her film is doomed to be compared with "Mister X". And she tried to distance herself as much as possible from Khmelnitsky's film. Alas, nothing good came of it" (I. Ivlev).

Collapse of Engineer Garin. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Scriptwriter Sergei Potepalov (based on the novel by A. Tolstoy "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin"). Actors: Oleg Borisov, Nonna Terentyeva, Alexander Belyavsky, Vasily Korzun, Gennady Saifulin, Mikhail Volkov, Vladimir Tatosov, Efim Kopelyan, Grigory Gai, Ernst Romanov, Vitaly Yushkov, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Algimantas Masulis, Valentin Premier Nikulin and others. **TV Premiere: October 15, 1973.**

Director Leonid Kvinikhidze (1937–2018) became famous for his television films "Collapse of Engineer Garin", "Straw Hat", "Heavenly Swallows", "June 31", "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" and others.

The Soviet press greeted "Collapse of Engineer Garin" with hostility.

For example, film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) wrote that although Garin "and utters loud words about the lust for power, but if you look at it, in the film he turned out to be a rather gentle guy. True, he decided two people, but solely for self-defense purposes. The factories were not blown up by him at all. Unless he stole his mistress from a millionaire, but you must admit that this is still a completely different matter than the delusional, truly fascist plans of the novel Garin. The collapse of such a Garin and the collapse of a petty individualist who dreams of enriching himself with his discovery are, as they say, two big differences. Would you like to see such a refinement of the character of the protagonist as a modernization of the novel?" (Revich, 1984).

An even more offensive and biting article was published about "Collapse of Engineer Garin" in the "Crocodile" magazine.

Writer and critic Mikhail Kazovsky (who, by the way, soon began to work in the editorial office of "Crocodile") literally smashed Leonid Kvinikhidze's film in all directions, claiming that "the artist O. Borisov sparkled with eyes, so it was immediately obvious that he was playing a scoundrel. ... The film ended, and the viewer sat dejectedly in front of the TV. "What for? He thought. — Why was it necessary to spoil the book, if nothing is said as a result? Again I was

mistaken for a round ignoramus who gladly eats a similar pate from Tolstoy's novel! Tell me, what did this film give me, apart from four ruined evenings?" (Kazovsky, 1973: 5).

However, already in the 21st century, film critic Irina Pavlova assessed "Collapse of Engineer Garin" quite differently: "Both Garin, Rolling, and the beautiful Zoya Monroz in Kvinikhidze's film are romantic figures in the direct understanding of a romantic hero as a person capable of much in the name of passion. In the name of the idea, in the name of their chimeras. But just such heroes must inevitably fall in a matchmaker with an organized, disciplined machine, with philistine mediocrity. It was this notorious tragic doom that made the central trio of heroes — regardless of love or enmity — the objects of painful sympathy. ... Borisov does the impossible — in one role he plays a man of honor, and a petty rogue, and a titan of thought, and an insignificant parvenu. About Borisov's Garin one could say "he is the devil!", If the place of the devil in this plot had not already been taken. ... It is difficult to remember in Russian cinema such an open struggle of passions, such vivid emotional outbursts with which this picture explodes, which is not at all about a hyperboloid and not even about power over the world. The picture is about people who do not know how (and do not want) to rule over themselves. And to match both heroes — a woman in this triad. Such a stylish, so fragile, such a Parisian heroine as Zoya performed by Nonna Terentyeva, also did not know our cinema until then" (Pavlova, 2010: 222).

I also recommend reading a detailed article by film critic Andrei Vyatkin, which provides a deep comparative analysis of two adaptations of the novel "Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin" (Vyatkin, 2020).

In my opinion, Leonid Kvinikhidze's film was far from being as simple and banal as it was presented in the reviews of V. Revich and M. Kazovsky. And the play of Oleg Borisov (1929–1994) in this film I can safely call an outstanding work in its carnival, semi-mystical interpretation. You can read more about this film in my article (Fedorov, 2012).

The views of 21st century viewers about "Collapse of Engineer Garin" are often opposed.

"Pro":

"I really love this show. In my opinion, all the actors are very well chosen: Garin, Rolling (both are simply great), Zoya — beautiful, smart, cold and scorching, as she was ... Captain Janis is good, although he does not appear for long" (Klauss).

"In this film, the title role was played by the brilliant actor Oleg Borisov. And that's it. Garin's personal qualities were conveyed by him with frightening authenticity, this is how this person should look" (Ilya).

"Contra":

"A monstrous perversion of the work! Tolstoy turns a propeller in his coffin! And the strangest thing: the novel is not so much fantastic as it is socio-political, and today it is so modern, relevant and sharp that the current censorship redirect to a different worldview channel would be quite understandable, but in 1973..." (Gefji).

"What a miserable movie! And this is how they imagined France and foreigners! The director put a cap on the actor — an airfield and at least someone pulled him up, said that it was ridiculous and ridiculous. Not to mention other clothes. All the actors are dressed like tramps. ... It has already been noted here — in one shot, trolleybuses and modern cars were visible through the trees. Didn't anyone pay attention to these and many other blunders? In a word, clumsy work. The film, which did not last, was not saved by the great Russian actor Oleg Borisov" (Vladkino).

Confrontation. USSR, 1985. Directed by Semyon Aranovich. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Oleg Basilashvili, Andrei Boltnev, Yuri Kuznetsov, Murman Dzhinoria, Victor Gogolev, Alexander Kazakov, Elizaveta Nikishchina, Stanislav Sadalsky, Talgat Nigmatulin, Sergei Bekhterev and others. **TV premiere: November 10, 1985.**

Semyon Aranovich (1934–1996) directed ten full-length feature films and TV series, many of which ("Torpedo Bombers", "Rafferty", "Confrontation") enjoyed great success with the audience.

Film critic Irina Pavlova notes that in "Confrontation" "the criminal, modern part of the film's plot was filmed as close as possible to the reality in which the characters live. But the entire retrospective part of the film, dedicated to the crimes of the main villain of the film, Krotov, is simply amazing... The naturalism of retrospective episodes sometimes just makes you close your eyes: the author is ruthless not only to his character, but also to his viewer. ... The editing of modern and retrospective episodes – hard, angular – constantly scratches the nerves, like the sound of iron on glass. The director does not allow the viewer to take a breath, to get rid of tension. In "Confrontation", the phenomenal reliability of the actor's performance is stunning. Andrey Boltnev as Krotov, Oleg Basilashvili as his pursuer, performers of episodic roles amaze with the absolutely "unpainted", colorless actor's intonation, which is completely unusual for the cinema of those years, and the unedited speech. ... There has never been such a frank and cruel story about the path of the punisher on our screen before. And I didn't know such a cold, ruthless power on the screen before" (Pavlova, 2010: 30).

It should be noted here that the style of the war episodes of "Confrontation" was later used by Semyon Aranovich in his, alas, unfinished film "Agnus Dei". I wrote about this film in more detail here (Fedorov, 2020).

Viewers are still arguing about "Confrontation":

"The film left a very strong impression. In addition to excellently played leading roles (Boltnev, Basilashvili), there is a whole galaxy of excellently played episodes in which you unconditionally believe in the actor" (Zabar).

"Wonderful screen adaptation, successful casting. ... This film is instructive in many respects, from history to morality, exposing the dirtiest vices of mankind: greed, envy, betrayal. This film is especially very useful for today's youth, brought up in the spirit of "there is "grandmother" – there is everything, and all means are good to achieve these goals" ... Personally, I am pleased with this film. Definitely – five plus!" (R. Tarabanov).

"A magnificent psychological film that can be watched many times, observing in each episode the scenes of the second, third plan, attributes, gestures, facial expressions, magnificent pauses of the characters (which only very gifted actors can withstand). Excellent work of the artist, some haircuts of the Germans for boxing, semi-boxing, Krotov's bald patches when captured in the basement are worth what! The camera work is excellent, the camera angles and "travels" are very successful. The staging of scenes of many episodes, the mixing of the chronicle with the footage shot "under the chronicle" is worthy of all praise! ... If I were empowered to take such actions, I would award the director, cameraman, artist, composer, and, of course, O. Basilashvili (I love his acting in all films – very natural in his roles), A. Boltnev. ... I generously omit minor flaws in the film. I know this film in detail... Thanks to everyone who loves this film; it is eternal for those who love their people, their Motherland" (George).

"In general, an excellent and adequate adaptation of the story by Yulian Semyonov ... But there is one "but" – Basilashvili's frankly weak role. ... I don't know why the director decided that Basilashvili was capable of playing a seasoned detective, but what is happening on the screen is depressing – this idiot – the official cannot keep the top ten in his pocket, where can he catch such a wolf as Krotov? As a result, the entire line of investigation is blurred, all the brilliant remarks of Kostenko Basilashvili are shamefully ruining. ... Apparently, as compensation for the role of Krotov, the brilliant Andrei Boltnev was invited. Here bravo – perhaps he created an image stronger than that of Semenov. In the book there was a disgusting, terrible, vile, but still a man, here Krotov is simply the embodiment of evil. I still remember some kind of fear that gripped me at the first viewing – completely irrational, as when meeting something terrible and incomprehensible ... It was Boltnev who made this picture memorable. Of course, the director helped him in every way in this – the joints of the chronicle and the game shots are simply irreproachable. So, aside from Basilashvili's failure, the film is excellent..." (Alexey).

"The film is controversial and interesting. I have my own subjective opinion, and I apologize if it offends someone, but I believe that Basilashvili failed the role. He doesn't even look like a middle-class investigator, and not like the seasoned wolf of the capital's investigation (I will note that then, in the 70s, the colonel was not given to anyone, this person really had to be an ace). The whole film is sluggish, dull. By the way, it comes to life only when the detective is not in the frame at all – for example, in scenes with the Queen, defending her interests, cursing "shortcomings" and

so on. That is, when his usual type was in the frame – an intellectual against a background of social conflict. ... there is a strong acting work (the same Boltnev, for example). But sometimes there is simply an unreal, fantastically implausible scenario on the verge of stupidity. Why does Krotov steal his photographs from the most distant relatives in all parts of the Union, while "forgetting" that his physiognomy was hanging on the honor roll? ... How does Krotov find his accomplice and traitor, when the KGB found him with great difficulty after so many years? ... Why would he kill that madam from the jeweler, while leaving her friend alive, with whom he also slept, and who turned off the alarm in front of him? Finally, why completely dismember bodies when it looks so wild and terribly unusual for those times that the highest authorities would take control of the investigation? Isn't it easier to simulate a robbery, an accident? A saboteur should understand this. As can be assumed that Krotov lived well for decades according to the documents of Melenko, who, like, disappeared without a trace, but at the same time, Melenko's mother lived peacefully in her village. That is, she, the only person who could confidently identify him as an impostor (which happened), he for some reason did not kill, only took the photographs of the real Melenko. ... That is, Krotov knew in advance that Melenko's mother would not look for him, and therefore did not kill her, but at the same time continued to work according to Melenko's documents in the neighboring region? Rave. Finally, why tie the bags with a specific and rare "parachute knot" that is just like an autograph of a trained German agent? How can a person who controls himself in small things do this to such an extent that he wiped off absolutely all (!) fingerprints in his apartment with a polish? ... In general, the script sagged not weak, excuse me. ... In the 1980s, it was no longer worth making films with script blunders like "The Exploit of a Scout" (Sabir).

Dangerous Turn. USSR, 1972. Director and screenwriter Vladimir Basov (based on the play of the same name by J. Priestley). Actors: Yuri Yakovlev, Valentina Titova, Alexander Dick, Elena Valaeva, Antonina Shuranova, Vladimir Basov, Rufina Nifontova and others. **TV premiere: December 16, 1972.**

Vladimir Basov (1923–1987) made 19 films, 10 of which ("Shield and Sword", "Battle on the Way", "Silence", "Life Passed By", "School of Courage", "Case at Mine Eight", "Return to Life", "Unusual Summer", "Blizzard", "Nylon 100%") entered the top 1,000 Soviet films. And that's not counting the highly successful television detective "Dangerous Turn".

Literary critic Alexander Anikst (1910–1988), highly appreciating the work of Vladimir Basov in "Dangerous Turn", noted that "the director created a system of cross movements on the stage space, which all the time remains the same... Crossing space diagonally, transitions from one corner to another are not mechanical in the teleplay, but semantic, they mean the movement of the center of the dramatic action. Thanks to this principle, the director solved the most difficult problem. After all, Priestley's play is "conversational," with relatively little external action. ... Rejecting straightforward assessments of man, Priestley is able, using the well-known saying, to see in the evil where it is good, and vice versa. This was also the basis of the carefully developed directorial score of the television film, which was a double success for Vladimir Basov as a director and as an actor" (Anikst, 1974: 6).

Indeed, the psychological detective Vladimir Basov's "Dangerous Turn", filmed simultaneously with three cameras, has become a kind of platform for testing new television technology. And the bright ensemble of talented actors assembled by the director allowed him to create ambiguous images of characters.

Viewers of the XXI century still remember this picture and, as a rule, highly appreciate it:

"I watched the film for the first time when I was at school. I was as if hypnotized by the action. ... Actors are incomparable: a real "textbook on acting" (Andrey).

"This is truly a masterpiece, when all the components of the film are at the highest level, they interact, giving rise to a work of art of unique charm" (Alena).

"Favorite movie. Music, atmosphere, acting is a real pleasure. Favorite actor in the film – Basov. ... he's just infinitely charming. ... I like Valentina Titova here very much. Her heroine is lovely, she is very sorry" (Reinmud).

"The film is mesmerizing. Its main advantage is that we see both reality and the looking glass, but at the same time there is the "mirror" itself – a thin line between this and that" (Svetla).

D'Artagnan and the Three Musketeers. USSR, 1979. Directed by Georgy Yungvald–Khilkevich. Scriptwriter Mark Rozovsky (based on the novel "The Three Musketeers" by Alexander Dumas). Actors: Mikhail Boyarsky, Veniamin Smekhov, Valentin Smirnitsky, Igor Starygin, Oleg Tabakov, Alisa Freindlikh, Alexander Trofimov, Margarita Terekhova, Alexei Kuznetsov, Lev Durov, Irina Alferova, Leonid Kanevsky, Boris Klyuev, Vladimir Balon and others. **Premiere on TV: December 25, 1979.**

Director Georgy Yungvald–Khilkevich (1934–2015) is known to viewers, first of all, for his "musketeer" films, and the most popular of them is the first – "D'Artagnan and the Three Musketeers".

This film owes its success not only to the popularity of the novel by Alexandre Dumas and the incendiary music of Maxim Dunaevsky, a bouquet of Soviet cinema stars, but also to the professionalism of the director Georgy Yungvald–Khilkevich, who managed to find his way to the adaptation of the classics, not being afraid of competition with Western "musketeer" film production.

Spectators of the XXI century in relation to "D'Artagnan and the Three Musketeers" are divided into two opposite camps. On the one hand, there are unconditional admirers, and on the other, opponents of this adaptation, accusing its authors of distorting the "spirit and letter" of the legendary novel.

"Pro":

"In my opinion, this is a great film from childhood with a unique sense of passion, even recklessness, and admiration for honor and friendship, which is absent in all foreign analogues and in most of today's domestic films of various genres. The image created by Boyarsky suits D'Artagnan Dumas and the spirit of the film itself" (Andrey).

"A wonderful film from childhood. Very accurate recreation of the historical era, life and customs. Vivid and memorable characters. When I watched the French film adaptations, the French performers did not make any impression on me and did not even remember, and ours created vivid memorable images. It is in our version that there is the idea of friendship, loyalty and devotion, while the French emphasize drunkenness, women, and debauchery. Our artists are perfectly matched. In the role of Athos, personally, I do not see anyone else at all, except for Veniamin Smekhov. Perfectly plays the role of the villainess Milady Margarita Terekhova: well, this is how Milady must, must be! Yes, they should not fall in love with her, she must cause horror with just one glance! Margarita Terekhova succeeded brilliantly! Best Milady. ... Mikhail Boyarsky is generally a 100% Gascon, young, passionate, bright, ardent, hot, and his appearance, he is absolutely the same as in the book of the writer Alexander Dumas ... He sings all the songs beautifully ... His dramatic voice is also very expressive, memorable. ... This is a good old beautiful favorite classic film, it's a sin to grumble or argue that something is wrong in this film, but you have to love and remain faithful to the end!" (Marina).

"Contra":

"The film is weak. Some kind of operetta based on Dumas. By the way, the casting was clearly out of touch: the queen was 21, not 40, there is no talk about my lady, everyone should fall in love with her, but here ... Before watching the film, I read the entire trilogy, and the film was a terrible disappointment, even in childhood" (Alex).

"The film does not bear comparison with the book in any way. If not for the songs for the film, then very few people would have remembered him. And the French version is still being watched. The main thing is the spirit of the times, the cult of the warrior–nobleman. And what about the Soviet version? The cult of drunkenness and fighting. Director of some kind of glove. Better read the book and listen to the soundtrack. Nobody has yet filmed this book properly" (Alexander).

Day Train. USSR, 1976. Directed by Inessa Selezneva. Screenwriter Boris Zolotarev. Actors: Margarita Terekhova, Valentin Gaft, Rimma Bykova, Tatiana Lavrova, Alla Meshcheryakova, Svetlana Nemolyaeva, Victor Bortsov, Alla Pokrovskaya, Tatiana Bestaeva and others. **TV premiere: September 2, 1976.**

Inessa Selezneva (1929–2006) directed 13 full-length feature films, of which the "Day Train" melodrama is probably her most famous work.

"Day Train" is a sad film about loneliness, about trying to somehow change your life. Despite the everyday realities of the second half of the 1970s, the problems of the characters in this picture are timeless and still touch the audience.

The duet of Margarita Terekhova and Valentin Gaft played intelligently, without pressure, and the tactful direction of Inessa Selezneva helps us understand the nuances of human characters and destinies...

Film critic Alexei Vasiliev wrote that "viewers saw Terekhova's performance... a detailed encephalogram of irritation in the interiors of modern Soviet urban life in the "Day Train". The 35-year-old librarian lives with an old caring mother and is burdened by attempts to marry herself. She loves her mother, regrets, understands everything. Even his unwillingness to get out of the shell. Terekhova says all this and plays. But the whole role is sprinkled, like pepper, with electric discharges of almost deadly intonations and gestures: the actress captures and shows all the sources of irritation that has been accumulating over the years in an apartment, in a regulated and unchanging shared life with someone. Particularly brutal is the moment when the librarian comes home from work, knowing that her mother has called from Moscow the same unwelcome overage son of a friend. Mother, as always, fiddles with the decrepit St. Petersburg castle, and Vera, the heroine of Terekhova, with such force pulls the door on herself that it gives out a rush to enjoy the sight of the horror of the old woman who was almost crippled. Only in one scene does the heroine leave any stiffness, stiffness of reactions: at the payphones, when she and Gaft are trying to call somewhere and a boy comes into the next booth. Terekhova becomes lightness itself, unplayed and at the same time unprecedented, as in the curriculum for a foreign language: you volunteer to look for kopeck pieces, explain which machines have already been tested, and they definitely do not work, tells you what to do. The thing is, this guy doesn't know her. The story of the heroine is unknown to him: for him it begins here. Perhaps he mistook them and Gaft for husband and wife, but for anything, simply – for no one. But for him she is definitely not a librarian, living with her mother, in love with Belmondo, in the company of a married groom who is dreary and unnecessary. In his eyes, it exists now – yes, an infinite amount of possibilities" (Vasiliev, 2018).

The older generation of today's viewers of "Day Train" tend to like:

"I like the film very much. Seems unassuming, but not easy. It seemed to me that Margarita Terekhova made the heroine more difficult than in the original source. "Quiet Emma" in the story knows exactly what she does not want, but does not quite understand what she needs. The heroine of the film is completely different. If Emma is passive, then Vera is rather contemplative. In my opinion, this is still not laziness, not spiritual sleep, but downright Taoist "non-action". It is useless to wait from her to act until there is a good reason for them. Everyday small events are not a burden for her, but they are not important. It is very important for her mother to fill the time with events of any caliber, and to take them seriously ... In general, the relationship between mother and daughter is very interesting, and, again, differently than in the story. In the film, the mother does not so much "direct" Vera's life as Vera allows her to do it, without taking away, so to speak, your favorite game. But behind their games and rituals, there is quite real love for each other. The two of them are exactly the family. In the film it is felt, in the story – I did not catch it. So this is an infrequent case when a film is better than the original source" (Inna).

"The film was filmed a long time ago, but there is something attractive in it that makes it watch without stopping, empathizing with the heroes, thinking out their fate ... Modern films do not reach this level, I don't remember a single one that I would like to watch, or rather – to peer" (Nelly).

"I like the film very much. And I always liked it. I was a teenager when I saw him for the first time ... He struck me with his life, somewhere cruel truth, as far as it was available to me then. The

film in all its mood strongly discord with the already then wildly popular "Irony of Fate". Of course, they have something in common, at least with a storyline. But how different are these works: a fairy tale and a drama. The people love fairy tales and listen to them happily. The drama is forgotten. I've been understanding the intricacies of this truth, albeit "cinematic," for 35 years, every time I watch it, I admire it" (K. Redkin).

But, of course, there are viewers who were not close to the problems of the "Day Train": "Awful movie. But I don't like artists either. Everything is bad for me. And the apartment is the personification of how you don't need to live. Mom is also very annoying to me. Some kind of naphthalene hysterics" (H. Mori).

Dead Souls. USSR, 1984. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Schweitzer (based on the work of the same name by Nikolai Gogol). Actors: Alexander Trofimov, Alexander Kalyagin, Yuri Bogatyryov, Larisa Udovichenko, Tamara Nosova, Vitaly Shapovalov, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Vyacheslav Nevinny, Vsevolod Sanaev, Alexey Safonov, Inna Makarova, Valery Zolotukhin, Yuri Volyntsev, Igor Kash Lidia Fedoseeva–Shukshina, Inna Churikova, Elizaveta Nikishchina and others. **TV premiere: November 19, 1984.**

Mikhail Schweitzer (1920–2000) directed 16 films, five of which ("Dagger", "Someone else's relatives", "Warrant officer Panin", "Sunday", "The Golden Calf") were among the highest-grossing Soviet films, and the audience remembered, of course, for film adaptations of literary classics ("Sunday", "The Golden Calf", "Carousel", "Funny People", "Small Tragedies", "Dead Souls", "The Kreutzer Sonata").

The appearance on the TV screen of "Dead Souls" caused a controversy among connoisseurs of Nikolai Gogol's work and film critics who tried to evaluate the film from the point of view of the cinematic concept of the author of the film adaptation.

In his letter to director Mikhail Schweitzer, film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) wrote: "You are probably accustomed to life experience and the hardships of the profession with a light heart to endure misinterpretations, such as those that have arisen today around your "Dead Souls". To me, from the outside, this whistle dance seems amazing, no less than a witches' Sabbath in daylight. ... People who pompously talk on the pages of "Literaturka" seem to me to be from a clique of Moliere characters, those who poured flour out of wigs, rattled klystyra and schoolboy Latin, but had no idea about life. ... I think that most of the opponents of your picture still remember the Moscow Art Theater performance, where, on the one hand, there was an open monstrousness of eccentric characters, and on the other, the "crocodile" clarity of satire, up to the poster. Apparently, they expected the same from you, and were bored, expecting, did not find – and did not see anything else that you prepared, – in my opinion... It seems to me that your "Dead Souls" is not just a good, successful movie, but it is a movie of amazing revelations and a deeply true, fruitful principle, which, I am sure, will still be picked up by others – if someone else now dares to step out on the path "filmmaker". I accepted everything in your film: the Roman prologue, the author–storyteller who interrupts the action or finds himself inside the action, I accepted the excellent asceticism of the general style of play, serious intelligent restraint on the lines with which it is so easy to caricature, I accepted the main thing – the conversation about the old, Gogol's as about today, sick, actual, ongoing. The fact that your governor could easily pass for the secretary of the regional committee did not shock me in the least. The fact that Korobochka, it turns out, is young, and Nozdryov is rudely hooligan, did not cut my ears in the least (by the way, Leo Tolstoy said: Nozdryov, with an emphasis on the first syllable, and he was listening to Gogol's reading – isn't it more accurate for a nobleman?). I also received two Gogols – black and white – and watched them with great interest. Sometimes, I will not hide, – as in the episode of a woman's commotion – I wanted a more impetuous story, but this is a good slowness, solid, and when it is shown again, it may be especially appreciated.

This is a general outline of my feelings. Separate, completely immoderate enthusiasm is caused by three figures: Trofimov, Smoktunovsky, Kalyagin. Trofimov, of course, is not Gogol, but it is precisely the "author" – a kind of emotional–figurative coordinate between Gogol and his text, the way we see Gogol, with catchy signs of appearance, with cheerful and bitter eyes, with unique,

wonderful intonations that interpret the text... Plyushkin is a powerful blow to the stupid tradition, which has only now revealed itself as stupid and primitive. Let it be grotesque, but not on a castrato in a woman's jacket, but on a stingy knight, eaten by a dashing illness. But even if none of this were in the film, but it would have been Chichikov, even then your work would have become a brilliant revelation. Chichikov, who has always been an entertainer for monsters, a personality without development, without drama, without bait for interest... But I sat down to write five lines! See how your soul is boiling! If you are still upset and gloomy, spit. Most people need to get used to your film. I am sure of very great success after the next viewing. And after the third, the film will be called an ideal adaptation of both the letters and the spirit. Once again, I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart!" (Demin, 1985).

Already in the 21st century, Valery Bondarenko considered that the accents in M. Schweitzer's film "Dead Souls" were "shifted from the opposition" satirical grotesque – high lyrics "towards synthesizing" grotesque lyrics". Why did the entire series of Schweitzer sounded not as an accusation (with obvious hints or, more precisely, mystical coincidences of Gogol's text with late Soviet social reality), but as a declaration of love for Russian culture and a Russian (albeit stagnant) person, "how God gave it to us" (Bondarenko, 2009: 29).

It is curious that even opponents of the TV movie "Dead Souls" noted the director's choice of sniper for the role of Chichikov, Alexander Kalyagin, who played here, perhaps, his most significant film role.

The opinions of today's viewers about "Dead Souls" are sometimes opposite.

"Pro":

"One of the most successful adaptations of N.V. Gogol. The script was written clearly with an eye to Bulgakov's arrangement of "Dead Souls" for the scene, so the figure of the Author was introduced. And that's the show's most coup. This thin, tall, eternally freezing and therefore rubbing his hands gentleman now in black, now in white, wandering around the world, standing alone somewhere near the main road with a bag in his hand; this spy on someone else's life, ironic commentator; this lisp, dictating his creations by the blazing fire, is the greatest writer of the Russian land ... Actor Trofimov plays him brilliantly. He plays the Creator, who transfers his pain to the book. Other actors also played splendidly, the music is wonderful" (Alexander G.).

"This film, like everything that Schweitzer and his wife have created, is a genius. In everything. In actors, in art production, in camera work, in music. This is a classic. It will forever remain a classic of Russian cinema. Of course, I would like to separately express my admiration for the work of Alexander Trofimov. ... This is how to read Gogol's text, keep the viewer in this way during his monologues, without looking up from the screen! With what feeling, with what understanding of the text, with what artistry, with what humor, and at the same time tragedy. Works like this are just gold letters in the artist's track record. ... And about all the actors in this film, one can only speak with admiration. ... Happiness that there is such a film, happiness that there are so many amazing actors in it" (M. Pena).

"I watched with pleasure all the adaptations of "Dead Souls", but the director Schweitzer has one hundred percent hit on the source. Amazing casting, where each actor is in his place. Selifan puzzled me a little, but then I realized that it was just such a fool on my mind that should be. Kalyagin, of course, gave Chichikov a fair share of his personal charm, and any character – take him – is a real star of Soviet theater and cinema. I applaud this film and always watch it with pleasure" (Avtogradets).

"Contra":

"The worst of all the film adaptations of "Dead Souls". I think the most canonical is the magnificent 1979 production with Vyacheslav Nevinny. She was followed by a TV show with Igor Gorbachev. There is one Luspekaev in the role of Nozdryov worth something! Well, in third place is the film with Belokurov... Why, five after the TV show with Nevinny, it was necessary to shoot this gray movie, and even a multi-part one?" (E. Logoev).

"Unfortunately, there are failures even in casting. ... Why Smoktunovsky – Plyushkin? In the sequel to the "Covetous Knight", or what? But this is a completely unnecessary association. Plyushkin is no longer stingy, but simply crazy. And Smoktunovsky has a dignity that would keep a person from Plyushkin's career. ... But the worst of all are female images: they are all shown as perfect fools! You can't do that" (Pescados).

Dirk. USSR, 1973. Directed by Nikolai Kalinin. Screenwriter Anatoly Rybakov (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Sergei Shevkunenko, Vladimir Dichkovsky, Igor Shulzhenko, Mikhail Golubovich, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Zoya Fedorova, Leonid Kmit, Natalia Chemodurova, Victor Sergachev, Rostislav Yankovsky and others. **TV premiere on June 4, 1974.**

Director Nikolai Kalinin (1937–1974) directed six full-length films, and at the age of 37 he died (February 12, 1974) while working on the sequel to "Dirk" – the television movie "Bronze Bird".

The official version of the director's death was as follows: infectious meningitis. However, according to the unofficial version, everything happened differently: Nikolai Kalinin was beaten by the police, and he died from the beatings received...

The fate of Sergei Shevkunenko (1959–1995), the performer of the main children's role in the "Dirk", was even more dramatic. At the age of 12, he made his debut in an episode of "The Musician's Sister" (1971), then briefly appeared in the detective "Fifty-Fifty" (1972). All-Union fame came to him after starring in "Dirk" and "Bronze Bird". Then there was a big role in "The Lost Expedition" (1975) and ... Then everything went, went downhill. Drinks, fights, "beautiful life"...

In 1976 – the first term for hooliganism. Two years later – a second term, this time he robbed a buffet at "Mosfilm"(!). As a result, Shevkunenko was convicted five times. And in the dashing 1990s, having already become a hardened criminal, he was shot dead in his apartment. It happened on February 11, 1995, Shevkunenko was only 35 years old...

The Soviet press greeted the TV version of "Dirk" directed by Nikolai Kalinin without enthusiasm.

For example, film critic Anri Vartanov (1931–2019) wrote about this film as follows: "At the beginning of the film, we meet with a dagger: one of the characters hides it and the other finds it. But after an energetic plot, long genre scenes follow, telling about grandfather, grandmother and their restless grandson Misha. Grandpa, like hundreds of his cinematic predecessors, wears a vest over a coat and constantly sniffs tobacco. Grandmother all the time reproaches Misha for pranks, but in each of her reproaches one can hear a barely hidden tenderness. I dwell on the clichés of characters and plot circumstances in order to understand where the boredom comes from, which suddenly overwhelms the viewer. Unlike the old film, where every previous scene gave birth to the next one, where, in Chekhov's words, each gun "fired" in a television three-part film, a significant part of the footage (almost half) takes the viewer away from the main action. And here's what is curious: for all their typical television detail, many episodes do not leave us feeling that we have met new people, learned about their lives. In a word, the footage of the picture is disproportionate to the artistic information contained in it: the film does not have what is usually called the second plan, we did not remember anyone in it, except for the main characters. This, of course, is to blame not only on the scripts, but also on the level of the director's decision. Hoping, obviously, that the intrigue will "take out", the director did not seriously bother that each plot line acquired its own artistic appearance. ... Many episodes of the film are staged and edited in an openly careless manner. For example, in the battle scenes, frames alternate monotonously, which show shooting guns and falling enemies. The wealth of cinematic means capable of conveying the intensity of the battle is reduced to a meager set of plans. The rehash of adventure movies is quite tangible. Dashing fights, tricks with flipping stairs, unexpected lyrical song inserts, horsemen slowly emerging in silhouette against the background of the hill – all this resembles shots from "The Elusive Avengers".

Amorphous dramaturgy march alongside sluggish directing, followed by the inexpressive acting of the actors. Unfortunately, the children, except for the lazy and charming Genka (Volodya Dichkovsky), turned out to be devoid of spontaneity. It seems that the disclosure of the secret for them is not an exciting, exciting adventure, but a boring task received from adults.

As you can see, the comparison of two readings of the same story is clearly not in favor of the television one. However, even without this comparison, the TV movie does not stand up to serious criticism. His failure prompts one to ponder some of the common problems of television "reading" fiction. I have already called the main feature of the television form of the story the slowness of the

narration. ... But it so happened that this ability of television began to turn into a kind of canon of form. Slowness has sometimes become an end in itself, serial production – a sign of a supposedly serious attitude to literature. The whole "aesthetics" of multi-part reading of literature flows from this principle. The proseism of literalist retelling begins to gradually replace the poetry of cinematic creativity" (Vartanov, 1974: 4–5).

Despite the harsh film criticism, "Dirk" still has a lot of fans today:

"I love this film for the atmosphere. It all turned out so that I do not want to either subtract or add anything. There is great nature, scenery, music. ... There is no hack in it, even in small things" (Semruch).

"I remembered the film "Dirk" for all my life. As a child, I never missed the screening of this film on TV. Even when I grew up, I always remembered this film and who played the main character in the film – Sergei Shevkunenko and also Vladimir Dichkovsky, Igor Shulzhenko. I think at that time half of the country girls were in love with the main characters of this film. ... I think this film has brought up many children of my generation in the spirit of patriotism, love for the Motherland" (Zulfiya).

But there are, of course, viewers who were completely rejected by the "Dirk":

"Never liked this trilogy, the book is better. It was possible to shoot everything more dynamically and not so depressingly. Most of all I didn't like Polyakov, who turned out to be absolutely cardboard and boring, as if it were not a boy, but an old man" (Fontanka).

"Fantasy is the Achilles' heel of the average Soviet writer Rybakov ... Again theft, first a dagger, then a scabbard to a dagger, accidental eavesdropping. ... And judging by how the former pioneers and Komsomol activists plundered the country's wealth in the 1990s, the heirs of the heroes of "Dirk" grew up worthy" (Sineman).

Dog in the Manger. USSR, 1977. Director and screenwriter Jan Fried (based on the play of the same name by Lope de Vega). Actors: Mikhail Boyarsky, Margarita Terekhova, Elena Proklova, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Igor Dmitriev, Nikolai Karachentsov, Ernst Romanov, Zinaida Sharko, Victor Ilyichev, Fedor Nikitin and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1978.**

Jan Fried (1908–2003) directed 16 full-length films, five of which ("Lyubov Yarovaya", "Twelfth Night", "Another's Trouble", "Green Carriage", "Farewell to St. Petersburg") in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films. For most of his life, Jan Fried has screened classical plays and operettas. He worked in television for a significant part of his life.

"Dog in the Manger" is a musical film by Jan Fried based on the classic comedy Lope de Vega (1562–1635) with the brilliant duet of Margarita Terekhova and Mikhail Boyarsky.

Spectators of the XXI century still love this movie, often preferring to watch such bright Soviet costume musical comedies than new Russian films and TV series.

Of course, this adaptation owes its popularity to the brilliant play of Margarita Terekhova. Film critic Neya Zorkaya (1924–2006) noted that "in the big and difficult role of Countess Diana... the actress opens the story of the soul, seized by passion and resisting, the story of a proud aristocrat who fell in love with a plebeian and managed to rise above her caste pride" (Zorkaya, 1979).

Film critic Alexei Vasiliev believes that "here Terekhova parsed into atoms the text of Lope de Vega and the mechanism of the human psyche that does not allow us to simply say: "I want to be with you, because then I am in my place, and life goes on as usual," when we feel it. De Vega's ancestral honor prevents the countess from uniting with her lover. Terekhova has a family honor – the palace where Diana runs to be caught. They are here – bare chests, a turn of the back and the slammed door of the Countess de Belleflor. But the actress is trying to figure out the mechanism of this behavior, which very much resembles her own, acting. It ordered not to get stuck in a successfully found role, genre, style, only to tease, but not to give it yet, to evoke love, but not to look for it again. Every word here is a brick in the Cologne Cathedral test of a declaration of love. One word should be given close-up, another should be a gesture, the third – a partner to dazzle with a glance. The two heroes endlessly bend around each other, alternating in places facing the audience. And the camera then zooms out, then approaches, then lopsided, obeying the

capriciousness of feelings and submitting to the completeness of the rhyme. ... The multifaceted and varied in form (but in essence – monotonous and permanent) irritation at everything that makes up her everyday life is the starting point of torment and character of both Countess de Belleflor and all her other heroines” (Vasiliev, 2018).

“The dog in the manger” is very popular with a significant part of the audience today:

“Of course, Boyarsky in the role of Teodoro is out of competition here – he is handsome, sings well, in general, he has a lot of advantages! As for Terekhova, I like her "in the mood". Sometimes I like it, sometimes her demeanor annoys. ... I like E. Romanov very much – great! Such a cute naive old man who was cheated. Well, there is no need to talk about Karachentsov and Igor Dmitriev – you must see it!” (Lina).

“Yes, Diana, of course, has a difficult character. Wayward, quick-tempered, capricious... But still charming. Maybe because Margarita Terekhova played superbly. ... And in Terekhov's Diana I just see behind the outer shell of a strong, powerful woman, a weak nature, tender, vulnerable, waiting for true love. I believe in her sincerity of feelings for Theodore. I love this film very much. Every time I relive the whole intrigue of the action. Great movie! Both music and songs. And the actors delight” (Anastasia).

“One of my favorite adaptations of European classics. The film was made with a deep understanding of all the nuances of the work of Lope de Vega, with a very serious attention to the peculiarities of the material culture of the era. Costumes, decorations – everything is on the level! Even the appearance of the actors corresponds to the aesthetic views of that time. So, Diana is not a burning brunette (a common stereotype), but a lady with golden hair and green eyes. This was precisely the ideal of female beauty in Spain in the Golden Age. There is nothing to say about the level of acting – great, for sure, bright” (Thea).

“The pigmentation of the main character does not raise doubts about her belonging to the Spanish grandees. Diana M. Terekhova is picky, capricious, impulsive at the same time, arrogant and unapproachable – everything is as it should be. I almost lacked temperament, and in some places I cheated (but this is in my opinion). Teodoro-Boyarsky is peculiar. In the play, he appeared to be different: a pretty, cute intellectual. And here it is closer to the "eagle-dzhigit". Outbred and noble. And I just adore this film: as a child I recorded it on a movie recorder (not a video – it wasn't there yet) since then I know it by heart” (Marina).

Dog's Heart. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vladimir Bortko. Screenwriter Natalia Bortko (based on the story of the same name by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Boris Plotnikov, Vladimir Tolokonnikov, Nina Ruslanova, Olga Melikhova, Alexey Mironov, Roman Kartsev, Angelica Nevolina and others. **TV premiere: November 20, 1988.**

Vladimir Bortko during his creative career, he has directed 18 feature-length films and TV series ("The Blonde Around the Corner", "The Idiot", "The Master and Margarita", "Taras Bulba", etc.). His most popular film was and remains a brilliant adaptation of Mikhail Bulgakov's story "Dog's Heart" (1988).

Film critic Valery Bondarenko wrote about this adaptation of "Dog's Heart" as follows: “Devastation is in our heads! When they begin to urinate past the toilet, it is devastation!”. This and other "counter-revolutionary" phrases of Professor Preobrazhensky firmly entered our consciousness during the years of perestroika – they entered, rather, from the screen than from the pages of a book. I won't be mistaken if I say: the film Heart of a Dog (directed by V. Bortko) is one of the best (if not the best, as time has shown) pictures of the perestroika years. ... The filmmakers performed an experiment on the viewer, paradoxically similar to the research of Philip Filippovich Preobrazhensky. First, you associate yourself with a she-lu-wondrous hungry dog, then suddenly you jump into the costume of a wealthy intellectual, a professor, and now the viewer's consciousness measures everything by his yardstick, seemingly sound, but socially rather limited. Without these Bolsheviks in "leather", headed by the careerist, demagogue and small cattle Shvonder (R. Kartsev), the world seems to be quite harmonious. Why did they suddenly appear and won it, these Bolsheviks? ... In V. Bortko's film there is no answer to this! In the mid-80s, the 1925 model was really alien to us, wild and ridiculous. Here he is dancing in a soldier's underwear with a

balalaika at the ready, singing mocking ditties in the face of the "scientific community". Here's a dirty stick to women. Here is shaking the right... We hadn't yet met the "brothers" — the Hams of the 1995 model — the new, as it were, masters of life. They will not dance to the balalaika, they will wear Armani jackets, but their manners, slang and all the concepts will be the same, Sharik, in fact. Only their ditties and thieves' "sufferings" will they pompously call "Russian chanson". I am sure: now we will "read" this picture in a different way, we will find new meanings. And this "multi-layered" movie is a great merit of the performers of the two main roles. Vladimir Tolokonnikov fits in the image of his hero, as it were, several creatures. This is a half-man — an idiotic Sharik, and an inveterate tavern hooligan — an "artist", and a tabloid rogue in lacquered boots, in a creepy, pimp some sort of tie, and, finally, a gloomy Soviet "employee" in a "leather" and a cap. Oh, this is not only to strangle cats! Such a person will happily throw people into the "funnel", but it is necessary, and "slap" without trembling hand — and as many as he is ordered to. At the end of the film, Polygraph Poligrafich Sharikov has all the features of a 1937 Chekist. This metaphor is carried out emphatically, constantly. Genuine "scary", "predatory", "carnivorous", which Tolokonnikov so convincingly conveys to the viewer, forced Bortko to opt for this then little-known actor, although at first the director planned to take his friend Nikolai Karachentsov for the role of Sharikov. Nature itself serves as a guiding thread in the maze of the hero's transformations. Tolokonnikov conveys a dark, wild natural element that rages in the soul of his character, in his human / dog's heart. the actor plays the instinct of survival and self-affirmation. Sometimes his hero is ridiculous and pathetic, but much more often — ominous. It seems that the role of Sharikov is not only the best for Vladimir Tolokonnikov, but it is almost the most energetically saturated image of the "boor" in all of our cinema. Into what ancient past and into what then the already near future of the "wild" 1990s did Tolokonnikov-Sharikov look with his gloomy, caked gaze? ... If his play is a natural element itself, then Evgeny Evstigneev builds the image of his hero on the finest interweaving of nuances. This delicacy of the drawing is not just the way the actor is used to presenting his character and era. Here the method acquires a certain special, fundamental meaning. Philip Philipovich Preobrazhensky in Evstigneev is the result of the development of culture, knowledge about life and man and — *respect* for oneself and people. Because respect is the essence, the real content of this result. The traditionalism and humanism of the Eustignean hero is the natural wisdom of a man of culture. True, this wisdom is limited in its own way and certainly does not save one from the vital pressure of the elements: the wise professor is more than once completely lost in front of the "tram boor" Sharikov. And if it were not for the strong fists of his assistant Bormental (actor B. Plotnikov)... Yes, and the household lordly "petty" luminary of science Preobrazhensky entirely depends on the goodwill of a high-ranking patient — a Soviet nobleman, in whose appearance the features of Stalin, Kaganovich and ... Sharikov! It is not culture that curbs the element, but the victorious element of the street uses culture. Moreover, culture itself is by no means a defense against the impulsive instincts of the street and nature... Here the filmmakers clearly deviate from what Mikhail Bulgakov wanted to say. But they already knew what everything was, after the 25th year, it is over... For 20 years the film has not aged one iota. However, just as the question of social justice has not receded into the past either" (Bondarenko, 2009: 17–20).

Film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev has an equally high opinion of the film by Vladimir Bortko, who considers this film adaptation "perhaps the best version of Bulgakov's works, which exactly corresponds to the writer's intention" (Kudryavtsev, 2007).

Alexander Vergelis recalls that this film "caused stormy rejoicing among the perestroika television audience. ... There was something to get excited about. Professor Preobrazhensky's monologue about the devastation sounded as topical as possible in the conditions of the growing perestroika mess. The images of Sharikov and Shvonder embodied the entire negative of the annoying Soviet reality. And the lordly Preobrazhensky and polished Bormental became the personification of "Russia, which we have lost." Only the scene of the professor's lunch in the half-starved perestroika time was perceived as a picture of a lost paradise. But it is not a matter of relevance alone. Perhaps, "Dog's Heart" is the best thing that Bortko did in the cinema. The film turned out to be funny and at the same time sad, its "cult" status was determined regardless of the socio-economic realities of the second half of the 1980s. ... For three decades, there has been a clear shift in perception. Evidence of this is the multitude of new responses about the film on the Internet, in the media and in the same kitchens where the European-style renovation has long

been done, but the walls still retain the aroma of the original incense. The Orthodox Church added its powerful bass to the chorus of critical voices. The evaluative pendulum swung in the opposite direction, making yesterday's favorites of the public, Bulgakov's Aesculapians, almost geniuses of evil. And, on the contrary, by significantly transforming the figure of Sharikov. ... I dare to suggest that today this film no longer looks like a satire on early Soviet society to a more or less cultured viewer. Having laughed a lot about Shvonder and his company, having admired the polished fragments of the old world, the viewer discovers in the motion picture the tragedy of a thinking creature who, by an alien will, became a victim of an experiment monstrous in its unnaturalness. At the same time, yesterday's scarecrow Sharikov in the eyes of many becomes almost a martyr. In any case, for me personally, the character of Vladimir Tolokonnikov, peering into his reflection in the mirror under the tragic music of Vladimir Dashkevich, evokes much more sympathy and even sympathy than before. Probably because in his ridiculous figure the spirit of a little man who has been hovering over the fields of Russian literature for two centuries has been embodied. Perhaps there are objective grounds for such a transformation. Yes, Sharikov is morally undeveloped, uncultured and generally unpleasant. His ignorance is aggressive he is a militant boor. The legacy of the criminal Klim Chugunkin appears in him too clearly, organically combined with the psychology of a homeless mongrel. But is he to blame for this? Is the Gorky tramp to blame for not only not being taught in the gymnasiums, but also systematically humiliating him, killing his human dignity for years, and ultimately suddenly putting him on a pedestal, proclaiming him the messiah and giving him a punishing sword?

Bulgakov's "Dog's Heart" is a multifaceted work. One can speculate about the problem of the unknowability of the universe or discuss the question of the moral responsibility of a scientist who invades the innermost limits of the Universe. And you can interpret the text as a pure satire on the contemporary author's reality, and in this case, interpret a physiological experiment on an animal only as a parody of a social experiment. The revolutionaries, instead of "walking parallel and groping with nature," resolutely take up the scalpel. It turns out, only in order to finally grab his head: "What a mess we've created with this pituitary gland!" It is quite obvious that the stray dog Sharik is the personification of the lumpen-proletariat. You sincerely sympathize with him when he is in his natural environment – in poverty and silent. ...

Bulgakov is a convinced evolutionist who watched live how the vivisectioners of the revolution were at work, in feverish anticipation of a miracle. And the miracle, meanwhile, did not happen. There was "the sweetest dog", it turned out "boor and a pig." According to Bulgakov, you just have to wait until the dog itself turns into a man. And if it doesn't turn, it doesn't matter: each has his own place. Progress will take care of stray animals. And "any woman" can give birth to a person. ...

The film images of Professor Preobrazhensky and Doctor Bormental initially entered the mass consciousness as standard samples of intelligence. Meanwhile, the professor is rather the antipode of the intellectual. Despite his typical origins for the various intelligentsia (his father is a cathedral archpriest), he is a snob with pseudo-aristocratic manners and an inveterate social racist. He openly admits that he does not like the proletariat. That is, the poor working people of the urban population are unpleasant to him. This is fundamentally at odds with the orthodox worldview of the Russian intelligentsia, which experienced an eternal guilt complex before the "people" and was initially focused on selfless service to them. The viewer was deceived by the external surroundings – manners and speeches. Philip Philipovich is much more like a rich and superficially Europeanized Russian merchant, than an intellectual. Moreover, from European ideas he assimilates not the most humane. Preobrazhensky, in fact, is a social Darwinist" (Vergelis, 2016).

However, the opinions of film critics are one thing, and the viewers' opinions are another. The sharp satire of Mikhail Bulgakov and its cinematic version made by Vladimir Bortko, in fact, divided the audience into two irreconcilable camps: to put it simply, supporters of socialism with its propaganda of equality and adherents of capitalism with its rights and opportunities for the elite.

Of course, among the current audience there are a lot of supporters of "Dog's Heart":

"A wonderful film... In my opinion, Preobrazhensky's profession does not matter, he personifies an intelligent man in the street who has achieved prosperity through his labor and wants to enjoy the fruits of this labor. And as a counterbalance to this image – Shvonder, who is

uneducated, does not want to work, it is easier for him to take away, confiscate, condense. ... But I think the main advantage of this film is the magnificent, brilliant play of Evgeny Evstigneev, who did not play Preobrazhensky, but was Preobrazhensky for a while. With all the arrogance, snobbery inherent in this character, and at the same time, a professorial analytical mind and medical cynicism. I watch the film several times a year and never cease to admire his performance" (Anda).

"I've been watching this film since childhood. True, when I was a primary school student and was not familiar with Bulgakov's work, I perceived this film as a comedy, mainly paying attention to the episodes when the dog turned into Sharikov... Years later, I understood the true meaning of Bulgakov's book and, accordingly, the film. And the film is made beautifully, in Bulgakov style. Bortko is a very good director. ... This is, so to speak, an anti-revolutionary work in which Bulgakov, allegorically, using the example of the transformation of a dog into a man, proves that it is impossible to change life for the better by revolutionary methods. Sharikov is a collective image of our Russian downtrodden people, which as a result of the revolution rose from the bottom, but culturally and morally remained at the same level of development. So it turned out that power was in the hands of such Sharikovs. As for Professor Preobrazhensky, he is by no means a positive hero. After all, the professor, not accepting the new power, cursing it, serves it... This is Preobrazhensky's "dog's heart", he cowardly serves the new power that he hates... Of course, the author puts the main anti-Soviet thoughts into Preobrazhensky's mouth (there is no one else!). He is the main accuser of the Soviet regime ... How superbly the actors played! And, of course, I never cease to admire the talent of Evstigneev, better than Preobrazhensky than he, I can not imagine" (A. Alekseeva).

"A wonderful film by V. Bortko based on the excellent book by M. Bulgakov. The idea of the relationship between the intelligentsia and the people is fully disclosed. The main character of this work is, of course, Philip Filippovich Preobrazhensky. He's smart, talented, brilliant if you like. But is he kind? Is he responsible? In my opinion, no. Yes, he earns his living by his hard work. He heals people, taking money from them, and has every right to do so. Lives beautifully in seven rooms, goes to the Bolshoi Theater on "Aida". He scolds the Soviet power, like all intellectuals, drinking vodka in the kitchen and eating it with pickles. And then, currying favor with a high party official outwardly similar to Stalin. As it is in our way, as it is in Russian. In some ways, Philip Philipovich is very reminiscent of Academician Ivan Petrovich Pavlov. He also scolded Soviet power in the USSR, and when traveling abroad, he said that Soviet power was a brilliant experiment that the Bolsheviks were putting on, and we should not interfere with this. And yet, the European luminary, puts a monstrous experiment on the transformation of a dog into a man. This is terrible! ... Nothing personal, just science. And who's the monster? Preobrazhensky or Sharikov? Lenin is also a great natural scientist, only he set experience over the whole country. And let's look at Ilyich not as a politician, but as a scientist, a naturalist. A very interesting picture is obtained. ... And Sharikov is a cast of our long-suffering people, with all its advantages and disadvantages. True, the disadvantages are more accentuated. Polygraph Poligrafovich is boorish, drunk, irresponsible, cunning. Yes, and also a careerist. ... And our intelligentsia is ambiguous, like Preobrazhensky and Bormental. ... Now about the film. A brilliant production with an unmatched cast. The great Evstigneev played beyond praise, but other artists are good as well. Plotnikov, Ruslanova, and, of course, Kartsev showed themselves at a high professional level. The role of Tolokonnikov stands apart. His Sharikov is complex and contradictory, he is not just a boor in the professor's chambers" (Andrey).

But there are also ardent opponents who believe that:

"This film is too opportunistic and politicized. ... and the hero of Evstigneev seems unpleasant, especially in comparison with the traditionally noble image of a Russian doctor" (Zoya).

"An unpleasant film that preaches class hatred. A bastard professor who profits from implanting monkey ovaries in lustful old women. With this money, he relishes relishing while people around are starving and sick. He does not help the people around him, does not heal sick children, but only rants about his exclusivity. Then he creates some semblance of a person and releases him into life, without bearing any responsibility for this. When problems arise, he kills his creation. He's a criminal! This story of Bulgakov is a stupid and evil allegory reflecting his anger at the world around him and devoid of any intelligible meaning. It is ridiculous to try to present this momentary unfinished little thing of Bulgakov as a serious conceptual work. The idea that if a

person was born in the lower classes, then let him remain there, is completely stupid, undemocratic and harmful. Moreover, I repeat that Professor Preobrazhensky comes out on the film as a fair bastard, and not a role model. He disgusts me with his smacking and self-admiration!" (Boris).

"Professor Preobrazhensky is deeply unpleasant to me (please do not confuse my attitude to the image with my attitude to the wonderful actor Yevgeny Evstigneev, who created this image). Preobrazhensky is deprived of the main thing that any doctor should have – kindness. He does not feel the pain of others. Maybe a cold experimenter should be like that, but some obsessed fanatic from science, he is usually "out of this world" in everyday life. Preobrazhensky is very much even "from the world." He loves to eat well and eats (in Soviet Russia in the 1920s), teaches everyone and everything, and considers those who do not fit into his idea of how to live as inferior beings. A stray dog needs to be given a home, or at least walk past him on the street without disturbing him. And not use it as an object for vivisection. Then, mind you, throwing him out into the street again when the experiment failed" (Claude).

"This work is anti-revolutionary in relation to the 1917 revolution, but revolutionary in relation to the Yeltsin coup of the 1990s. This film became the ideological program of the "democrats", their banner. Primitive imagery – the movie labels came in very handy. This is Sharikov, this is Shvonder, and this (with reverence) is Professor Preobrazhensky. Primitive people need primitive images. How many times have I heard: "No, you are not Professor Preobrazhensky!" Primitiveness did not even allow these people to understand that Preobrazhensky is by no means a positive hero... Our "elite" speaks about ball-balls at every step, implying, as a rule, ordinary people. ... The question arises: why did people who called themselves "democrats" (now, however, they are more often called "democrat") liked this film so much, whose idea is the superiority of some classes and the inferiority of others? Poisonous burps from this film still occur. ... The film has provided the townsfolk and political opponents with insulting labels as a polemical weapon. "You are Sharikov!" Says one. "You are Shvonder!" Is the answer. Ideas preaching class inferiority have long been refuted by science and prohibited by law. When someone says that the "Sharikovs" and "Cooks" once came to power, that is why everything became so bad, then it is reasonable to object: after all, the "Sharikovs" and "Cooks" led the country well – created a superpower, won the war with Hitler, who conquered almost all of Europe, created a nuclear weapon that ensured the survival of the people, went into space ... How did they do it, I wonder? But what did the non-Sharikovs do to the country, we see and know. Over the past twenty years, not a single important plant has been built! It seems to me that right now there is a transformation of the population into stupid, undeveloped and uneducated "ball". Including thanks to films and TV shows sponsored by our "elite" (not – "ball"). And no one questions the talent of V. Bortko and the quality of the actors' performance" (Spiridon).

Duenna. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Grigoriev (based on the play by Richard B. Sheridan). Actors: Tatiana Vasilyeva, Irina Muravyova, Alexander Korol, Marina Livanova, Alexander Safronov, Evgeny Leonov, Vladimir Zeldin, Lyubov Polishchuk, Vladimir Soshalsky, Semyon Farada and others. **TV premiere on July 27, 1979.**

Mikhail Grigoriev (1925–1979) directed 11 full-length feature films, mostly television.

The musical comedy "Duenya" is the most famous film by Mikhail Grigoriev, which became a bright benefit performance of the wonderful actress Tatyana Vasilyeva.

This movie has many fans even today:

"I love this film very much and consider it one of the masterpieces of our cinema. Undoubtedly, Evgeny Leonov and Tatiana Vasilyeva are just beneficiaries here. And what is Tatyana Vasilyeva's "trademark" laugh here, and how brilliantly the scene of her expulsion from the house of Don Jeromo (Zeldin) is played. ... The film can be watched endlessly and from any place" (Igor).

"I really love and have always loved the film "Duenna". Wonderful famous and beloved actors. Their acting in the film is excellent. As well as music, dances and songs" (Valerochka).

Elders Son. USSR, 1975. Director and screenwriter Vitaly Melnikov (based on the play of the same name by Alexander Vampilov). Actors: Evgeny Leonov, Nikolay Karachentsov, Mikhail Boyarsky, Natalia Egorova, Vladimir Izotov, Svetlana Kryuchkova and others. **TV premiere: May 20, 1976.**

Vitaly Melnikov ("The Chief of Chukotka", "Seven Brides of Corporal Zbruev", etc.) during his long film career he has directed two dozen full-length feature films, and the adaptation of A. Vampilov's play "Elder Son" is one of his most popular works.

The "Elder Son" had an unusually happy on-screen fate: he was received with great enthusiasm by both film critics and viewers.

For example, Nikolai Savitsky wrote that "the creators of the TV movie dealt with rich, original and not at all simple dramatic material. Of course, there was a temptation to get carried away by the vaudeville-comic plot of the play, to transform it into a kind of funny sitcom with a sentimental eccentric in the center. This is how the "Elder Son" is played in some theaters, not really thinking about the meaning, into the background of the thing. The play-parable also admits another, albeit just as wrong, approach. After all, on it one can, say, make an edifying film; accurately deduce the "assessment for the behavior" of each of the characters, so that in the end morality sounded, lapidary and unambiguous, like in a fable. And all this would be contrary to the author's intention. For with Vampilov, the serious does not dissolve into the funny. Just his deeply worn out and pure thoughts about the world and man, crystallize in the atmosphere of the comic, the sadness of a smile means for him no less than joy. And the writer has no intentions to directly normalize and "teach" how to live – he wants to learn it themselves. With his unobtrusive help. It was not for nothing that he did not like dramatic (in the literal, everyday sense of the word) outcomes, did not deprive his heroes of either life or hope, as if speaking under the curtain, in an undertone: "Start over. After all, you now know how to do it".

It's the same in "Elder Son", in the play and in the film. Sad and funny side by side. An honest lesson – no edification. Good without a ceremonial halo – and evil, not marked with an indelible seal. And yet they collide. Their irreconcilability is obvious. Good triumphs. But his triumph does not come in a showcase duel, not on the Jura, but in the secret places of the human heart: the heroes of the "Elder Son" pass into a new quality, acquiring moral values that they did not have before. ... The transition from vaudeville misunderstandings, from a buffoonish situation, almost farcical moments, to a psychologically motivated evolution of thoughts and feelings previously unknown to characters, this transition on the screen is almost elusive. Preparation for it goes gradually, imperceptibly: nothing significant seems to be happening in the frame. But something accumulates there, ripens, And finally comes true, amazing – nothing more and nothing less. ... The polyphonic dramaturgy of the "Elder Son" required precise and inventive direction, capturing subtle emotional nuances, and demanded a deeply felt acting. The main difficulty that, as it seems to me, the director of the film faced, was to reveal on the screen the connection between the external, eventful part of the plot and the latent, contradictory and complex processes of the spiritual life of the characters, to correlate the actions and their moral justification. Disregarding some of the details, it can be argued that the director V. Melnikov overcame this difficulty, and the image created by Yevgeny Leonov allows us to speak of indisputable creative success" (Savitsky, 1976).

Film critic Nina Ignatieva (1923–2019) stated that "the screen work not only preserved the aesthetic richness of the literary basis – it opened to the viewer the unique world of the writer, whose talent was able to reflect the world of life itself in such a peculiar and unforeseeable manner. ... Like Vampilov, Melnikov is attracted by the unusual, unexpected, although not so incredible collisions that Melnikov's heroes fall into. It attracts, again, not by itself, not as a starting point for an anecdotal or adventurous story, but as an opportunity to show the natural and natural in a casual, paradoxical way, to extract a general moral idea from everyday unexpectedness. The director is most interested in the spiritual life of the heroes, whether he directs the films "Mom Got Married", "Hello and Goodbye" or talks about "Ksenia, Fedor's beloved wife." And of course, Vampilov's "Elder Son" with such emotional energy aimed at affirming moral values, could not but arouse the creative activity of the artist, who calculates the moral potential of screen heroes not by

simple addition–subtraction, but in a much more complex way. It seems that in the creative program of the director, first of all, one should look for an explanation of the luck, which is rather rarely carved when theatrical drama collides with the screen. ... The director of the picture does not refuse the theatrical "playful beginning", he creates on the screen the atmosphere of a joke so that it gives the action a special comedic lightness and enthusiasm, but at the same time in its orchestration slightly enhances dramatically and psychological motives so important for Vampilov. After all, the play begins with vaudeville, but does not end with it. Only we accept the conditions of stage action proposed by the author, how he suggests completely different, makes other notes sound, evokes new feelings... And what seemed to be nonsense, an unthinkable turn of events, suddenly turns into something vitally serious and significant, which amused – now takes on dramatic features. ... E. Leonov equally accessible to comedic and dramatic colors, even tragic, he knows how to find their living combination, "mix" in the right and correct proportion. And this is extremely important in the embodiment of Vampilov's drama, which treats genres quite freely, combining different genre motives sometimes in the most bizarre outlines" (Ignatieva, 1977).

Film critic Nina Dymshits noted that in "Elder Son" "the melodrama, which played the role of a set in a psychological drama, was introduced into it with the help of a curious method of playing in a game, a play in a play. Thus, in the context of the Vampilian drama, in this local situation, the preaching, persuasive power of melodrama sounded with even greater clarity. However, here also begins a kind of polemic with melodrama, with its unambiguity, predestination. Clearly constructed by Volodya Busygin and having fulfilled its task of pitying Sarafanov without fail, the melodrama comes into collision with more complex phenomena. And here her kingdom ends. It falls into the position of being refuted. ... So why did it happen like this? Because it is impossible to approach life with the standards of a conventional melodrama (as well as vice versa). Therefore, everything in the "Elder Son" and turned upside down after how Volodin's "inner" play began to expand into a Vampilian play. Vampilov's successful genre formation is the result of an interesting synthesis based on the opposition of genres. The beginning melodrama comes into conflict with complex psychological life phenomena, becomes the basis of its conflict and, so to speak, a defamatory moment: through melodrama Vampilov took a fresh look at the far from new problems of "strange people" and "realists" (Dymshits, 1977).

Already in the 21st century, film critic Natalya Miloserdova wrote about "Elder Son" as follows: "The dramaturgy of A. Vampilov – dense, saturated with conflicts and passions, whimsically intertwining the fate of the heroes – turned out to be close to Melnikov. For him, the complexity and uniqueness of a person's spiritual existence is the most interesting thing. ... "Good or bad, but I love you, and this is the main thing!" – these words of Sarafanov are the key to many locks in Melnikov's work. Love is support, salvation, consolation, reward. It changes a person, elevates him, makes him stronger, wiser, she is valuable in herself. A person who is deprived of the gift of love, who has abandoned it, who has lost faith in its saving power and need for it, loses support in life, and life loses its meaning" (Miloserdova, 2010: 304).

The film critic Sergei Kudryavtsev also highly appreciates the "Elder Son": stage roles for the entire creative biography. The general success of the creators of "Elder Son" is precisely that they felt the sometimes paradoxical combination of typical "provincial anecdotes" in Vampilov's drama and the vision of the dramatic breakdown of the era inherited from Chekhov even in the simple everyday behavior of the heroes, their usual everyday existence where— then "far from Moscow." ... It's not really so important whether Sarafanov could remain a creative person without sacrificing himself for the sake of his children, nor does it really matter that Busygin, who foolishly called himself his son, is not at all such. Only the inner conviction of the best Vampilov heroes that the possible is real turns them from ordinary provincials – losers into absolutely genuine, irreplaceable people, whose price does not exist and cannot exist" (Kudryavtsev, 2006).

For the 21st century viewers, "Elder Son" seems important and necessary, it affects them emotionally:

"An incomparable film. How many emotions do you experience from Leonov's game! You watch his Sarafanov as a relative from the outside – at times you are happy, and sorry, and painful, and, of course, awkward for him. ... It is gratifying that against the background of such a high acting aerobatics as Leonov's play, young actors are also delighting"(Lika).

"I saw this film again. Well, it's a wonderful film, everyone is playing so splendidly ... Sorry for Sarafanov, sorry for Vassenka. And their neighbor Natalia too. She is so lonely in her soul. And then Vassenka takes it out with her love, which she absolutely does not need" (Tamara).

"Great film, one of my favorites. Like many here, I periodically review it. First of all, it is a wonderful literary basis. Vampilov's plays and films based on them never leave anyone indifferent. This is also a Soviet-style high-quality picture: director's, cameraman's and other works, and the musical accompaniment (S. Rachmaninov) is very appropriate. The acting work is amazing. The images are deep, multifaceted. Especially, of course, E. Leonov is impressive – the unsurpassed image of Sarafanov. The film is psychologically subtle, kind, relevant for all generations and times" (Alina).

Eternal Call. USSR, 1973–1983. Directed by Vladimir Krasnopolsky, Valery Uskov. Screenwriters Anatoly Ivanov, Konstantin Isaev (based on the novel of the same name by Anatoly Ivanov). Actors: Valery Khlevinsky, Vadim Spiridonov, Nikolai Ivanov, Pyotr Velyaminov, Ivan Lapikov, Vladlen Biryukov, Ada Rogovtseva, Tamara Semina, Andrei Martynov, Vladimir Borisov, Efim Kopelyan and others. **TV premieres: June 2, 1976 (part 1), 16 January 1979 (part 2), May 11, 1983 (part 3).**

Vladimir Krasnopolsky and Valery Uskov are known to viewers mainly on television series ("Shadows Disappear at Noon", "Eternal Call"), although they also have notable works in cinema (for example, the film "Not Justified").

There were few TV series in Soviet times, so almost every one of them became an event in public life. Millions of viewers, the very next morning after the premiere of the first episode, heatedly discussed its characters and argued, sometimes to the point of hoarseness...

The film adaptations of the novels by Anatoly Ivanov (1928–1999) "Shadows Disappear at Noon" and "Eternal Call" told the dramatic stories of Siberian families spanning several decades. Here there is a revolution, and a civil war, and collectivization, and again a war, this time – the Great Patriotic War...

These films, the filming of which lasted more than a dozen years, brought all-Union fame to Pyotr Velyaminov, Vadim Spiridonov and many other actors.

Viewers today are ready to argue about these series (or about serial feature films, as they were called then). For example, the site "Kino-teatr.ru" contains several thousand audience reviews. Most of them are enthusiastic and only a few mention the ideological presentation of the material...

"Yes, this is a great movie. He brought together a galaxy of wonderful and talented actors. It was created for several years, made by masters of their craft. In comparison with the current multi-part cinema (TV series), it simply does not go. It is extremely difficult to show the life of a family for almost a century against the background of various events in the country. The actors were aged so that it really was visible – here the hero is a young guy, but he has already become a man, and now he is an old man, wise in life. And you believe in it ... Unfortunately, I don't see such works in modern cinema. If they want to show that the heroine has grown old, they simply put on gray hair and in rare cases make up her face, depicting old wrinkles. But to convey on the screen how a person changes over the years, becomes wiser, more experienced, to convey all the longing for the past years – it's not that simple" (Elizaveta).

"This is not a movie. This is a film! I watched it several times, but each time it evokes a lot of emotions. It is an empty matter to list the names of the actors who played incomparably in this film, because I think that all the roles (major and minor) were played with talent!" (Angelica).

"I want to express my admiration for all the actors in this film! ... I carried the "Eternal Call" through my whole life. From the age of 10 to this day, this film remains a masterpiece for my soul! A selection of actors based on the likelihood of relative external similarity, the subtle play of all negative and positive characters was so real that it caused love, hate, tears, joy, sadness and all other feelings, experiences in me. ... Now I can't even find an analogue for this film... It simply does not exist. Low bows to all the actors and creators of this film! Delighted to the depths of my soul!" (Vladimir).

Fathers and Sons. USSR, 1983. Directed by Vyacheslav Nikiforov. Screenwriters Evgeny Grigoriev, Oscar Nikich (based on the novel of the same name by I. Turgenev). Actors: Vladimir Bogin, Vladimir Konkin, Natalia Danilova, Alexey Kuznetsov, Tatiana Dogileva, Boris Khimichev, Eduard Izotov, Muza Krepkogorskaya, Vladimir Samoilov, Svetlana Ryabova and others. **TV premiere: July 10, 1984.**

Director Vyacheslav Nikiforov directed 26 full-length films and TV series, among which there are such famous robots as "Fathers and Sons" (1983), "At Nameless Height" (2004) and the series "The Executioner" (2014).

Film critic Valery Bondarenko writes about "Fathers and Sons" by V. Nikiforov as follows: "This Soviet drama is disappointing at first. Well, we have already weaned from such long, drawn-out general plans, and from the imposing tempo rhythm, and from the music in Mikael Tariverdiev's elegantly sentimental key... – I think, false – meaning, which is indispensable for any serious late Soviet film! ... But something clicks in us suddenly after the first, without enthusiasm, swallowed frames. Unusual quality factor of the production – *krak!* – breaks our obstinate obstinacy, our skepticism. And here we are – completely in Turgenev's novel, in his poetic and ironic, and fearfully visionary world – in a world fanned by the elegy of loneliness ... Already in the 1980s, the dispute between the rootless "nihilist" Bazarov was perceived as a tribute to the official Soviet ideology (actor V. Bogin) and secular ex – "lion" Pavel Kirsanov (B. Khimichev). But here are the wonders: this debate, which seemed like a boring obligatory illustration for textbook paragraphs 25 years ago, now looks amazingly relevant! And we are convinced that Bazarov is right, unconditionally, unconditionally. ... In general, I would call the 1984 version of "Fathers and Sons" "male," Bazarov. The creators of the TV movie emphasized the sensual, erotic background, which, after an explanation with Madame Odintsova, tenfolds Bazarov's strength, loneliness and aggressiveness towards others. He loves deeply and hopelessly, because affectionate and intelligent (and seemingly not at all as strong as Turgenev intended) Odintsova (actress N. Danilova) is simply not able to love him as recklessly: the heaven is not the same! Having drawn this element more frankly than it is intended in the novel, the creators of the movie received a lot of additional semantic nuances, and most importantly – made their "nihilist" in a modern way alive, deeply human. ... Separately, it should be said about the work of Boris Khimichev. He makes Pavel Petrovich an elegant knight with the eyes of a wounded chamois, an extremely handsome and subtly charming person (which cannot be said about the hero of Turgenev). With a general characteristic, the artist creates the image not only (and, ultimately, not so much) of a representative of the estate, but the fate of a person who is deeply unhappy, lonely and persistent in his voluntary renunciation of the world. Thanks to Khimichev, a special note sounds in the film – a lyrical one, the very elegy of loneliness, which is essentially important to Turgenev himself. This complicates the meaning of the picture and enhances its artistic impact" (Bondarenko, 2009: 152–154).

The views of this century viewers about this adaptation of "Fathers and Sons" are generally positive:

"An adorable, delicate, soulful film, touching to the depths of the soul! Schubert's music seems to penetrate the very essence of you, and so strongly, accurately reflects the moods of the characters and their own state of mind! A rethinking of life is happening! The ensemble of actors is amazing, Natalia Danilova is just amazingly good! Not a single ounce of falsehood in the actors' play, And Vladimir Bogin played so deeply, so nakedly and subtly a passionary and loving person that frost on the skin! This is the most "live" artistic image that I have ever seen in films. The scenes of the declaration of love were filmed impossibly strong and beautiful, a deep bow to Vladimir Bogin! A deep bow to the director and everyone who participated in the creation of the masterpiece!" (Valeria K.).

"This is the best film adaptation of a novel. Perfectly flawless from an artistic point of view. Great casting. Deep respect for the literary source (which happens quite rarely). The only film adaptation that has the right to compete, in the best sense of the word, with the literary source" (M. Rusov).

"I really like this film, this particular adaptation. When I looked at it for the first time, it seemed to me at times a little prolonged. Now I see in a completely different way. This is a very emotional film. Every frame, every small detail, everything... has a meaning and conveys certain emotions, mood. As if you live in a film, in that time, in that space. Undoubtedly, expressive, beautiful, surprisingly accurate music helps a lot here. ... In the hero performed by Vladimir Bogin (although this is very carefully hidden by the hero) we see a person – with his character, feelings, thoughts and experiences... And you feel this, it is very subtly conveyed to the viewer – through voice intonations, eyes, movements (you have to play like that!)" (Oksana).

"Great movie. One of the best films of the Soviet and modern times. I watch the film periodically, and I want to watch it all the time. The selection of actors, the images are so harmonious that it is better not to create. The school studied the work of Turgenev, but it was Nikiforov's film that opened the full picture of Bazarov's character. Wonderful actor Vladimir Bogin. ... Vladimir Konkin is a well-known actor in other films, but here, it seems to me, this is his best role" (Aminova).

"In my opinion, an excellent film adaptation, the atmosphere of that era is well conveyed. After the film, I felt the novel itself better, which was taught quite straightforwardly at school and was not at all one of my favorites with Turgenev, seemed outdated in terms of its problems. Excellent actors" (B. Nezhdanov).

But there are viewers who are dissatisfied with this picture. Vyacheslav Nikiforov:

"I didn't like the film very much. The operator's camera does not try to understand what is happening, but simply stares blankly at the characters. ... The main thing is that I really didn't like Bazarov and Arkady, they just "turn up my nose". In Turgenev's novel, they are normal (positive) heroes, albeit with their own troubles" (A. Seleverov).

"It seems to me that the film did not work out. This happens. More precisely, the film is normal, but this is not "Fathers and Sons". The book is so lively, driving, modern, and the film is monotonous, drawn out, silent. Longs, tiresome silences, some kind of behind-the-screen voices – and all this is accompanied by sluggish music. This style of the film is not even bad, but this is not a novel about Bazarov! This is some other film about other heroes" (Leta).

For Family Circumstances. USSR, 1977. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Screenwriter Valentin Azernikov (based on his own play). Actors: Galina Polskikh, Marina Dyuzheva, Evgeny Steblov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Evgenia Khanaeva, Nikolai Parfyonov, Vladimir Basov, Rolan Bykov, Anatoly Papanov, Nina Doroshina, Lyudmila Zaitseva, Nina Agapova, Lev Durov and others.
Premiere on TV: April 29, 1978.

Alexey Korenev (1927–1995) directed 13 films. These are mainly comedies, among which there are, in my opinion, very successful ones ("Literature Lesson", "Big Break", "For Family Circumstances").

A whole constellation of talented actors shone in the comedy "For Family Circumstances", but the magnificent episodic roles of Vladimir Basov and Rolan Bykov were remembered no less than the main roles, remarkably played by Galina Polskikh, Marina Dyuzheva and Yevgeny Steblov.

The film "For Family Circumstances" still has a lot of fans today:

"How lovely! One of our best comedies! This film has no age. He is for everyone and forever. That only one cast is worth, the fireworks of stars, the impression is that in the picture all the roles are the main ones. This is one of our family's favorite films. Yes, they can do something like that now! Never!" (Tatyana).

"I really love this film. It's so kind and light that you can watch it often – often, which is what I do. And all the actors play great in it. ... Lovely! Good movie! There are so many funny moments in it" (A. Alekseeva).

"Great comedy. Sparkling. I love many comedies by A. Korenev. They are kind, vital, funny, musical. The film "For Family Circumstances" is also funny, life-like. Everything is like in life. ... Gorgeous artists starred in the film. I can't even single out any of them, all are beautiful, amazing" (Alfiya).

Formula of Love. USSR, 1984. Directed by Mark Zakharov. Screenwriter Grigory Gorin (based on "Count Cagliostro" by A. Tolstoy). Actors: Nodar Mgaloblishvili, Elena Valyushkina, Alexander Mikhailov, Alexander Abdulov, Semyon Farada, Elena Aminova, Tatiana Peltzer, Leonid Bronevoy, Alexandra Zakharova, Nikolai Skorobogatov, Anna Andriyanova and others. **Premiere on TV: December 30, 1984.**

Mark Zakharov (1933–2019) was a famous theater director, however, his films, shot for television ("12 chairs", "Ordinary miracle", "That Same Munchausen", "Formula of Love") had great success with the audience.

... The famous magician and foreteller of human destinies Count Cagliostro comes to distant and mysterious Russia, where his roguish servants in an inspired duet sing the unforgettable couplets "Uno momento" in the hope of winning the heart of the Russian beauty...

Yes, there was once a time when the whole country knew: for the New Year holidays, they will definitely show a new fairy tale by Mark Zakharov according to the script by Grigory Gorin. Ironically and philosophically rethinking familiar stories from childhood, this brilliant duo gave the audience either "Ordinary Miracle", then "Baron Munchausen", then "The House That Swift Built", then "Formula of Love", then "Kill the Dragon"... Alas, the times of parables, allegories, parables, hints, read with delight by the then intelligent public, have passed. And already, alas, neither Grigory Gorin nor Mark Zakharov is with them...

But their films continue to delight new generations of viewers. With the wit of dialogues. Brilliant acting (which is only one role of Leonid Bronevoy in the "Formula of Love"!). An elegant direction, embroidering brilliant patterns on entertaining plots with a philosophical double bottom.

Soon after the premiere, the Soviet press greeted the "Formula of Love" very friendly.

For example, film critic Julius Smelkov (1934–1996) wrote that in the "Formula of Love", as well as other "in the films of Zakharov and Gorin there is always a certain overtone – everything is fun, witty, but a sad motive is heard" (Smelkov, 1985: 13).

And the film critic Valery Kichin noted that "for all the amusement and variety showiness of the director's manner, the film does not lose either the seriousness or the depth of the theme" (Kichin, 1985: 9).

In the 21st century, the "Formula of Love" became the subject of a special study by Alexander Ryaposov, who argued that "we have before us a plot about human capabilities and the limits of those, that is, a plot about the existence of such spheres and areas of being over which a person has no control" (Ryaposov, 2017: 74).

The opinions of today's viewers about the "Formula of Love" are sometimes polar – from complete delight to absolute rejection.

"Pro":

"A film that has become a classic. Mark Zakharov is a great director. The film is a miracle" (Pavel).

"The film is great, one that is like a reference book – you often look in and still can't get enough of it. Every time you are happy to meet the heroes of this sweet kind story, dressed in the humor of Grigory Gorin. Not a single superfluous word, not a single superfluous hero, beloved talented actors and the endless charm of provincial Russian antiquity warm the soul and heart" (Victoria).

"The film has been hopelessly loved for a long time! The film is all woven from improbabilities and absurdities, so dearly loved and so often quoted. The film has collected an incredible scattering of actors. And every, absolutely every actor in his role sparkles, shimmers and throws incredibly attractive energy on the viewer. This film has a special atmosphere" (Natalia R.).

"Great film, great actors, masterful directorial work. But I separately want to bow to the screenwriter. Bravo, Gorin! Each phrase is an aphorism. These aphorisms often help me in different life situations. ... You never get bored of watching. Everything came together" (Ilya).

"Contra":

"A typical film by Zakharov. His films are recognizable. They are united by tortured ideology. Yes, exactly tortured. A claim to be philosophical that does not exist. Moreover, if we talk about this film, then it is, in general, some kind of delusional" (A. Alekseeva).

"I don't understand this film at all. He annoys me. The point is most likely in antics. Not in dancing, but in the antics of the dancers. A pile of acting talents, but the movie did not work. ... Another failure of Mark Zakharov. I don't like this movie" (Andrey P.).

"This film is a complete disappointment for me. Tolstoy's story "Count Cagliostro" is filled with mysticism, mystery, an excellent horror movie could be shot. And Zakharov built some kind of ridiculous booth. In general, I do not like his movies with unfunny jokes, attempts at originality and claims to be philosophical" (Rose).

Gadfly. USSR, 1980. Directed by Nikolai Mashchenko. Screenwriters Julius Dunskey, Valery Frid (based on the novel by Ethel Lilian Voynich). Actors: Andrei Kharitonov, Anastasia Vertinskaya, Sergei Bondarchuk, Ada Rogovtseva, Konstantin Stepankov, Konstantin Tsanev, Grigore Grigoriu, Irina Skobtseva and others. **TV premiere: November 3, 1980.**

Nikolai Mashchenko (1929–2013) directed 17 full-length feature films and TV series ("The Commissars", "How the Steel Was Tempered", "Gadfly", "Paris Drama", "The Wedding with Death", etc.), but he was best known for two television adaptations – "How the Steel Was Tempered" and "Gadfly".

Film critic Alena Moskalenko–Vysotskaya writes that "the reference to the book of the same name by Ethel Lilian Voynich in Soviet cinema already took place in 1955 with Oleg Strizhenov in the title role, when the novel was filmed by the Soviet director A. Fainzimmer. ... As in the first and in the second cases (in "Gadfly" by N. Mashchenko – A.F.), the interpretation of the main idea and images of the novel were transferred to the screen without changes. The plot did not change, the motivations for the actions of the main characters did not undergo any transformations, the revolutionary spirit of the work was in tune with the ideological criteria of Soviet society. N. Mashchenko, continuing to develop his creative principle – everything is subordinated to the main character, – left the secondary characters without vivid individual traits. By weakening the psychological development of the protagonist's environment, the director thereby impoverished the overall concept of the film, after all, outside of a reliable background, it is difficult to believe and understand the motivation of many actions of the heroes. In general, in the film adaptation of "Gadfly"... the theme of the novel and the genre were preserved, artistic grievances did not undergo any special changes" (Moskalenko–Visotska, 2020: 123).

Evgeniya Korzhunova believes that in the center "Gadfly" N. Mashchenko "a conflict of feelings – the love of a son for a father and a father for a son, a tragic conflict, the origins of which are so deep that they go beyond beliefs and ideas. This conflict grows from the depths of the human soul and rises to a metaphor – a metaphor for comparing the suffering of a son with the torment of Christ, and a father with the torment of the Heavenly Father, who gave his only son to die on the cross. to the parallels arising in my mind, not at all Italian in nature. Sacrifice, atheistic fanaticism, contempt for compromise – all or nothing! And next to this – a tendency to psychological breakdowns, a passion for poetry, a suppressed thirst for love, transformed into abstract love for oppressed humanity. These qualities are highly characteristic of the Gadfly – Arthur Burton, but not only to him (and maybe not so much) something dear, Russian, too Russian shines through the Italian context. I am getting acquainted with the biography of Voynich, and it turns out that she lived in Russia for a long time, she is familiar (not with the revolutionary movement in general, but personally) with Russian revolutionaries, was fond of Dostoevsky's work, translated Russian classics. So this is where this depth comes from in comprehending the contradictions of revolutionary consciousness, where from love to fanaticism one moment, these breakdowns and ecstatic enthusiasm, this faith in a new idol – (Revolution), who subsequently devoured his children. Of course, we are contemporaries, who have known the horrors of revolutionary fanaticism that survived a totalitarian regime, the word revolutionary does not inspire enthusiastic feelings at all, We are contemporaries, we know how these fiery calls for the struggle for the happiness of mankind ended – with the Gulag and the totalitarian regime. But then, at the dawn of the

revolutionary movement, when the Revolution seemed beautiful and desirable – many (and not only cynics and crooks), many passionate dreamers, and enthusiastic and thirsty for change, these Grinevitskys and Kibalchichs, smart and talented, were tempted by it. And among them the most irreconcilable were the "priests", who came from the families of priests. This phenomenon of the transformation of religious consciousness into a revolutionary one (when moral guidelines are turned upside down) is largely explained, as N. Berdyaev wrote, by the peculiarity of the Russian mentality. The idea becomes God (or rather, replaces a place that belongs only to God), and turns into death, destruction and degeneration" (Korzhunova, 2010).

Of course, from today's point of view, much – both in the novel and in its adaptation – seems controversial, if not completely rejected by a significant part of the audience.

However, in the early 1980s, viewers were strongly impressed by the emotional acting of Andrei Kharitonov (1959–2019), Sergei Bondarchuk (1920–1994) and Anastasia Vertinskaya.

And, comparing the *Gadfly* performed by Oleg Strizhenov with the *Gadfly* of Andrey Kharitonov, the audience, as a rule, came to the conclusion that, despite the difference in acting interpretations, these images look very impressive.

The opinions of many of the current about the television series "Gadfly" are still enthusiastic:

"The film is amazing. In my opinion, this is the best role of Andrey Kharitonov. And music... I have never seen such a piercing melody conveying the inevitability of tragedy anywhere else" (Svetlana).

"I have reviewed this brilliant film, my impressions have hardly changed. Strongest emotions! I think the film would have lost a lot without the tragic music of Mozart and Purcell. In general, the film is certainly not about a revolutionary, but about the same thing that other masterpieces have been filmed and written about: about love for parents and children, about unfulfilled mutual Love, which seemed to have no obstacles, about hopes, disappointments and betrayal, about good and evil, etc. Andrey Kharitonov's play deserves special admiration. ... The revolutionary activity of the *Gadfly* is not close to me. In general, the word revolutionary for many, including for me, rather has a negative negative connotation, and most of all that repels me is their idea that the end justifies the means. And it is also unpleasant that they not only sacrificed their lives to something incomprehensible and abstract, but they also willingly sacrificed other people's lives, but no one asked them for that. ... That is, for each person, happiness is something of his own, and the revolutionaries, it turns out, impose their idea on everyone. It seems to me that Voynich correctly noted what exactly makes a person a revolutionary. Lack of family relationships and love. And such a person is free and terrible for those around him. If the *Gadfly* knew how to forgive (and were Montanelli and Gemma personally guilty before him?), Then he could well live and rejoice, and not be tormented by constant grievances. And you cry the whole film over human blindness, but is it only Arthur? In general, I think, unlike the *Gadfly* of Oleg Strizhenov, who is undoubtedly a positive hero, negative features are clearly visible in the *Gadfly* of Andrei Kharitonov. And therefore the image becomes more vital, vivid, convex" (Julia).

"The film "*Gadfly*" is a work of art and that's why I think so: firstly, camera work, mind you, almost any stop-frame in the film is a finished picture, and what costumes, what interesting close-ups, the film is amazingly beautiful! Secondly, the director created at least an independent dramatic work, which at the same time conveys the spirit of the novel, not to mention the wonderful music; selfless play of the cast, all the characters do not leave you indifferent, even the turns of speech in the script are surprisingly poetic in places"; the film keeps it in one breath, not letting go, which is characteristic only of masterpieces" (Vorobyov).

"This picture was shot by director Nikolai Mashchenko in a heroic and romantic way. The story turned out to be very emotional, hysterical, somewhat exalted. ... In the film A. Kharitonov played very well and S. Bondarchuk was brilliant. ... Bondarchuk conveys well the throwing, the confrontation between duty and love in Montanelli" (Alexander).

But, of course, there are also categorical opponents of the "Gadfly":

"Indeed, who is the *Gadfly*? Maybe try to make it out in more detail? Fanatic. An ordinary fanatic. Partly a sadist – he clearly enjoys insulting people and pouring poison into Montanelli's mental wounds. The thing is that in Soviet times, Voynich's novel was raised on the shield, undoubtedly, for ideological reasons – revolutionaries, Carbonari, the struggle against the

occupiers, and, well, atheistic propaganda. In fact, the character portrayed by Voinich (and she was friends with Kropotkin, Stepnyak–Kravchinsky and fully shared their radical views) is rather weak and one–sided. It is not shown in development, it is needed to propagate an idea” (Aha).

Gloomy River. USSR, 1969. Directed by Yaropolk Lapshin. Screenwriters Yaropolk Lapshin, Valentin Selivanov (based on the novel of the same name by Vyacheslav Shishkov). Actors: Georgy Epifantsev, Victor Chekmarev, Lyudmila Chursina, Valentina Vladimirova, Givi Tokhadze, Alexander Demyanenko, Afanasy Kochetkov, Valentina Telegina, Evgeny Vesnik, Ivan Ryzhov, Daniil Netrebin, Yuri Medvedev and others. **TV premiere: April 15, 1969.**

Yaropolk Lapshin (1920–2011) directed 16 full–length feature films, three of which ("Game without Rules", "Gloomy River" and "Privalov's Millions) were included in the 1000 highest–grossing Soviet films.

The drama "Gloomy River" was originally filmed for television, and in April 1969, its four–part version was shown on central TV. The success of the premiere was such that a two–part version of the film prepared for cinema was soon released and managed to attract 15.5 million viewers to cinemas.

In her book about the work of Y. Lapshin, film critic Natalya Kirillova writes that “the country fell in love with this film right away, thanks not only to the familiar plot, but above all – to the striking acting work. Many viewers have sunk into the souls of the proud beauty Anfisa performed by Lyudmila Chursina, who played a strong and passionate nature, fighting for the right to love and be loved” (Kirillova, 2015: 62).

XXI viewers remember this film with pleasure:

"This kind of cinema is the decoration of the national cinema, our golden fund! Here is a sample of how to make a movie, if the artist has something to tell people! What acting work, what gorgeous images, what a masterpiece role! ... No falsehood, throw a bridge to the present day, you won't be mistaken! Such a film has been filmed for centuries, as long as there is Russia, you can show this masterpiece always topical, fresh, interesting! Everything in this work – from script to directing, from actors to artists – is of the highest standard! Real art!" (I. Zemlyakov).

"The most brilliant film! One of my favorites. Each time you again feel and experience the tragedy of individual people and the entire Russian state, inevitable death" (S. Varagina).

"The film burns through and through. Wonderful production, great actors. ... It is strange and insulting that such a talented and original writer – Vyacheslav Shishkov – has somehow been forgotten lately. ... But we are not discussing the writer, but the film ... I really liked the game of Alexander Demyanenko. Lyudmila Chursina – what a beauty! A very worthy adaptation of a wonderful novel!" (Efrata).

"It is a masterpiece! I watched this movie countless times, but every time I like it more and more! What actors, what reliability!" (Yuri).

"Indeed, every time the film is watched with great interest. And there are no such films now because there are no such actors and directors. When you watch this film, you don't even think whether the actor is playing badly or well, such thoughts don't even come to mind. The real life of the heroes floats before you" (Novikova).

"It seems to me that this is the best Soviet film. Chursina has surpassed herself here. Surprisingly, all the actors play great here! And Demyanenko has the best role in his life. And each artist gives out comic episodes. Truly a masterpiece of masterpieces. Perhaps this is the best film in the world" (Victoreshek).

Golden Mine. USSR, 1977. Directed by Evgeny Tatarsky. Screenwriters Pavel Grakhov, Artur Makarov. Actors: Mikhail Gluzsky, Evgeny Kindinov, Oleg Dal, Larisa Udovichenko, Igor Efimov, Igor Dobryakov, Oleg Efremov, Igor Yankovsky, Zhanna Prokhorenko, Lyubov Polishchuk, Elena Fomchenko, Lev Lemke, Tatiana Tkach, Igor Dmitriev and others. **TV premiere: November 10, 1977 (Leningrad TV), June 14, 1978 (Central TV).**

Evgeny Tatarsky (1938–2015) known primarily for his television films with Oleg Dal in the lead roles – "Golden Mine" and "Adventures of Prince Florizel". In total, the director has 14 full-length feature films and TV series.

In my opinion, "Golden Mine" is worth watching, if only because of the talented acting of Oleg Dal...

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) wrote that the detective story "Golden Mine" "does not look like a new word in the adventure genre at all. Much of it is familiar, seen or heard. These are not borrowings, this is a deliberate work within the framework of a certain subject–thematic canon. It sometimes seems that the authors aim to show the potential of a typical detective "norm". The usual twists and turns of intrigue, proven mechanisms for tying, ending, traditional figures ... But it is worth sprinkling all this with the living water of the moment, adding here and there vital nuances – and you're done: the film will make the viewer worry, and then, you see, it will reveal something new. Indeed, in the chess box assigned to the villain, behind the dark glasses of O. Dal, something not fictional at all flashed, something scary, not yet captured by ready-made performances" (Demin, 1981).

Film critic Irina Pavlova recalls that "Golden Mine" "was always played on TV in the USSR on Easter night in order to distract people from religious intoxication. He (E. Tatarsky – A.F.) himself laughed at this very much, but secretly he was proud. And there was something to be proud of. Because viewers were drawn to TV not only by the detective story, not only by the desire to know who killed and how they would be caught. Drawn by the gloomy face of Oleg Dal in dark glasses. Attracted by the mysterious, hitherto unknown beauty with an unusual face – Lyubov Polishchuk, whom Tatarsky made a star in an instant. ... And in general it was terribly interesting to look at the tavern–social life of Soviet shadow workers, which no one showed before the "Golden Mine", but Tatarsky did. And it turned out not just a police film, but a movie about another reality, which for the majority of viewers sitting in front of the "box" was almost "life on Mars." While filming a television movie "about the everyday life of the Soviet militia", Tatarsky managed to remove an encyclopedia of "the secret Russian life." That is why the film was reviewed ten times" (Pavlova, 2015).

Today, the "Golden Mine" has many fans among the audience:

"An interesting film with an excellent cast" (Natasha).

"An absolute masterpiece of the detective genre. No one has ever managed to shoot something better. Quite good melodrama inserts, wonderful music" (Ilya).

"Excellent detective! You know it by heart, but you always look like the first time. Brilliant works of Dal, Polishchuk (always good, even in episodes), Dmitriev, Kindinov. The magnificent music of Schwartz, without which the film can no longer be imagined" (Nastya).

"My favorite movie. Today I will look again. I love everything in it. Especially great music. ... There is no better detective" (Lola).

"It's a wonderful movie after all! One of the main advantages is a non–trivial plot, thanks to which the film looks with great interest, even when you already know in advance how it will end. And one cannot fail to mention the magnificent music of I. Schwartz – it "raises" the film very high" (Moviegoer).

However, there are also severe opponents who notice the smallest "blunder" (where, for example, did the glasses disappear from the table of one of the characters, if a second ago they were?) And claim that "the characters are unconvincing, lifeless, without any worries", etc.:

"I watched "Golden Mine" twice, and for me this is the most ordinary detective story. Similar stories can be found in the world detective literature. Great actors play their functional roles. All detectives are good, all thieves are bad. No psychologism of the characters, no personal ups and downs and tragedies, no amazing life collisions... No problem! Surveillance, pursuit, detention, interrogation – the usual whirlwind... Only Mikhail Gluzsky stands out slightly for the better, the rest of the characters are unconvincing, lifeless, without any worries. Maybe I want a lot from the detective? But you can't create a script and shoot as if there is no experience in creating sharp life stories..." (Greibenkin).

"This film is a clear evidence of how weak script development is not saved by anything ... As a matter of fact, not a single character is properly spelled out here, including the main characters.

Everything is somehow light sketch, sketchy, indistinct, vague. Everything is superficial, casual, half hint" (Lukyan).

Green Van. USSR, 1983. Directed by Alexander Pavlovsky. Screenwriter Igor Shevtsov (based on the story of the same name by Alexander Kozachinsky). Actors: Dmitry Kharatyan, Alexander Demyanenko, Borislav Brondukov, Alexander Solovyov, Regimantas Adomaitis, Konstantin Grigoriev, Eduard Martsevich, Victor Ilyichev, Ekaterina Durova and others. **TV premiere: December 28, 1983.**

Alexander Pavlovsky (1947–2018) directed two dozen full-length feature films and series ("Ar–hi–me–dy!", "The Trust That Burst", "Marshmallow in Chocolate", etc.), but the most famous of them, of course, "Green Van".

This adaptation includes almost all the storylines of the story of Alexander Kozachinsky (1903–1943).

The former high school student turned police chief is played here by the extremely popular actor Dmitry Kharatyan in the 1980s. And his assistant was the incomparable Borislav Brondukov (1938–2004). Their duet looks very comical on the screen, especially in terms of the fight against moonshine and horse-stealing...

The offscreen voice of Armen Dzhigarkhanyan (1935–2020) gives the whole action of the film an ironic flavor, while the songs of Maxim Dunaevsky performed by Kharatyan sound romantically naive.

I was lucky I was a little familiar with Alexander Pavlovsky, and at one of the Bolshevik cinema seminars he enthusiastically told me the amusing details of the filming of this now legendary film. In particular, that "Green Van" initially really wanted to shoot Vladimir Vysotsky (and, most likely, he would have removed if he had not passed away in 1980). And how Leonid Yarmolnik and Stanislav Sadalsky did not pass the casting for the main role of Volodya Patrikeyev. And that Alexander Pavlovsky remembered Dmitry Kharatyan and thought that he needed such a singing young actor in the "Green Van"... You can read about the other two "Green Vans" (1959 and 2019) here: <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/filmhistory/tri—zelenyh—furgona—5e077c9a16ef9000ac18f62e>

Konstantin Pozdnyakov believes that "The adaptation of Pavlovsky is more in line with the book. The authors of the film treated the main characters of the story with great care: Volodya, as in the work, tries to teach his partners, Shestakov and Grishchenko, although it becomes clear to the viewer that both "subordinates" have "figured out" the former schoolboy; the dialogues between Patrikeyev and Krasavchik also correspond to their relationship in the work. True, the finale is not devoid of tragedy: unlike the story, Shestakov dies during a raid on Cherven, but this change does not look excessively arbitrary treatment of the text, since it becomes an additional and convincing reason for the arrest of Volodya, the cowardly Grishchenko (who, apparently due to his class origin, was not punished in the 1959 film). Another correct decision of Pavlovsky is to give episodes in the film when the heroes enjoy life, then remembering football matches, then bathing the horses. In these moments, the enjoyment of a peaceful existence, opposed to the surrounding chaos, is obvious" (Pozdnyakov, 2017: 123–124).

The opinions of today's viewers about this adaptation of "Green Van" are sometimes polar.

"Pro":

"No matter how much I look, I always look in anticipation of joy, pleasure. Wonderful movie! I adore B. Brondukov, A. Demyanenko is wonderful, E. Martsevich is good, of course, D. Kharatyan, and the small role of E. Durova is also noticeable. Interesting, touching, funny – with some kind of nagging sadness and kindness" (Lyudmila).

"The film is wonderful! The actors are super!" (Anna).

"I love this film very much, I saw the premiere as a young girl, and it just sunk into my soul" (T. Rodionova).

"Contra":

"The film is much less interesting than the book. The book is funny, but in the film they caught up with a serious "blizzard"... Who has not read the book, the film will do for that, for the one who read, alas..." (Alex V.).

"A silly film that does not reflect the realities of those years. The main character wears a modern jacket and football boots (this is in 1920!) well-fed, lazy peasants, without fear in their eyes, transfer potatoes to moonshine. ... The film is a fairy tale" (D. Otekhn).

Guest from the Future. USSR, 1984. Directed by Pavel Arsenov. Scriptwriters Pavel Arsenov, Kir Bulychev (based on the science fiction novel by Kir Bulychev "One Hundred Years Ahead"). Actors: Natalya Guseva, Alexey Fomkin, Ilya Naumov, Vyacheslav Nevinny, Mikhail Kononov, Maryana Ionesyan, Elena Metelkina, Evgeny Gerasimov, Vladimir Nosik, Igor Yasulovich, Georgy Burkov, Valentina Talyzina, Natalya Varley, Andrey Gradov, Elena Tsyplakova and others. **Premiere on TV: March 25, 1985.**

Pavel Arsenov (1936–1999) directed ten full-length feature films, but his most famous work was the fantastic series for children "Guest from the Future".

"Guest from the Future" aroused the admiration of a mass audience and controversy among film critics.

Film critic Alla Romanenko notes that in the series "Guest from the Future" "all the moves and turns of the plots are known from children's literature: chases, escape of heroes, tracking down criminals, danger, ... rescuers in the form of a cool team, etc. And yet, the main success was the charm of the performer of the role of Alice – Natasha Guseva. ... But the most charming in this film is the Image of the Future, where wonderful people live, and minor flaws like bureaucratic inventory and formalism are found only in a robot... There is no need to fear such a future" (Romanenko, 2010: 39).

However, the film critic Andrei Vyatkin categorically disagrees with the opinion of Alla Romanenko, who called his article "Why is the series "Guest from the Future" bad?" and justified his opinion by the fact that the film turned out "a shameful failure of Soviet science fiction" (Vyatkin, 2020), as its surroundings turned out to be too plain and poor.

And she took the "Guest from the Future" very seriously Maria Yavorskaya, who accentuated the ideological and political components of the film: "The Soviet system was perceived as eternal and unchanging. This gave birth to the description of the future through the eternity of the present. The future of Kolya and his classmates could not radically differ from their present, since even Alice's "amazing future" is part of the "eternal" Soviet system, the ideal image of a socialist state, despite all its exoticism and differences from Soviet everyday life, unusual for a Soviet schoolchild ... The film also contains the theme of the inviolability of the Soviet system. Here it manifests itself through the establishment of continuity between the present and the future. Alice's phrase in a dialogue with Julia: "We are you" becomes a call for the construction of a future that depends on what each of the Soviet people has done today, and correlates with the idea of building a communist future. The connection between eternity and the future is also reflected in the shots of futuristic Moscow, the panorama of which remains unchanged after a hundred years" (Yavorskaya, 2019).

However, film critics are film critics, and viewers are spectators. And they, as a rule, treat the "Guest from the Future" very warmly even today. Moreover, there are even fan-clubs of the book, film and the main character – Alice:

"This movie is just super! I am already 20 years old. It would seem that everything, basta, hare to fall into childhood... But, in fact, I really love this film, and always cry very much at the end. ... This is a childhood film. ... I think it doesn't matter how old you are: you can always watch your favorite children's film, plunge into childhood. It's just superb that there are such films. They are real!" (M. Queen).

"The most beautiful film. He returns to the bright past. And although this past is now accepted to scold ..., it was ours, it was bright. ... Then we lived and breathed easily, deeply, despite the inevitable difficulties, lived merrily, were happy and free. All were more or less equal, there was no greed, rudeness and stupidity that flourished in our time. Life was wonderful, it is a pity that it is now far from us. The new generation will not understand us, let it be. But we were happy. And it seems to me that many will support me" (A. Melnikov).

However, among the audience there are, of course, supporters of the point of view of film critic Andrei Vyatkin:

"I didn't like the film either in childhood or years later. The main character – except for huge eyes and nothing to remember, there is almost no game, everything is so perfect, correct and boring to a yawn. The plot is stretched out, uninteresting, with a claim to a philosophical idea of a perfect universal future, etc. Not an ounce of real, as they say, driving adventures. I will not say anything about the scenery, entourage, shooting on location, since the budget deficit was clearly felt. Well, how can we do without communist ideology – red ties, vigorous friendly pioneers, a flag over the Kremlin! Hence, such a rejection of this film, because reality spoke of the opposite – the pioneers were not always so friendly, and (oh, horror!) Many boys already smoked, swore obscenely and almost did not wear ties. Girls, as a rule, were not like Alice either. That country was slowly dying, so even the song about the beautiful far away is so wistfully pitiful" (April).

Gypsy. USSR, 1979. Directed by Alexander Blank. Screenwriters: Alexander Blank, Natalya Kalinina, Rادی Kushnerovich, Anatoly Kalinin (based on the novel of the same name by Anatoly Kalinin). Actors: Clara Luchko, Mikhail Volontir, Alexey Nikulnikov, Olga Zhulina, Nina Ruslanova, Maya Bulgakova, Matlyuba Alimova, Leonid Nevedomsky, Vladimir Zamansky and others. **TV premiere: August 18, 1980.**

Alexander Blank (1938–2000) directed eight feature-length films and TV series. Preferring to work on television, he was remembered by the mass audience for "Gypsy" and "Return of Budulai."

Coming to the adaptation of the melodramatic novel by Anatoly Kalinin "Gypsy", Alexander Blank understood well that he was competing with the "Gypsy" (1967) by Evgeny Matveyev. And here the choice of an actor for the main role was very important, who could overshadow the charismatic Matveyevsky gypsy, which the audience liked so much. Blank's choice turned out to be a sniper: Mikhail Volontir (1934–2015) fell in love with the mass audience (especially, of course, women) from the very first frames of the series.

Film critic Anastasia Krainer believes that the series "Gypsy" somewhat idealized "the appearance of a nomadic people. In addition, one cannot fail to notice explicit propaganda in the film. The viewer was taught that the Gypsies were no different from other Soviet citizens: the same Budulai was a wonderful blacksmith, his son entered a military school at the end. In general, the film conveyed the following mood: there is nothing for the gypsies to roam, it is time for them to get used to civilization. However, this did not make the movie worse, it just brought the general tone of the time. ... In general, Blank's film turned out to be very kind, naive in the Soviet way, but it focuses on universal human values: love, friendship, justice ... "Gypsy" is not just a movie about Russified nomads who changed their wanderings to settledness, dashing horses – to the hearth. This is a film about how people, regardless of nationality, learned to live and survive, heal the wounds inflicted by the war and continue to believe in the best. This is a film about how the loneliest and most unfortunate gypsy with the most "golden hands" in the village found his happiness and found his own son without programs like "Wait for Me". This is a film about love, which is born even on a scorched war, unfavorable soil, about love, taking root and healing, helping to cope. With everything. Even with the worst. "Gypsy" is a movie about a man who, no matter what, will withstand and go on, even if there is not a drop of hope left. A movie about a man who, whether he is a gypsy or Russian, will fight to the last drop of blood for his home, where to live and die, where the graves of ancestors are scattered with marks, for his relatives, for his honor. "Gypsy" is not even quite a movie, it is an imprint of an era in which we no longer live, an era, where there is no way back. We must remember this era. After all, not knowing your past, you cannot build the future" (Krainer, 2009).

Many of today's older people are still delighted with this trilogy by Alexander Blank:

"Thanks for the kind light film. I watched in my youth with great pleasure, I am reviewing it and now, when I am forty, I have my own children. Love and parting in this picture do not go one without the other, but as the love of the main characters it does not look like love from newfangled paintings, including the series of the same name "Love and Parting". In "Gypsy" there are no

intimate scenes, but the sincerity of feelings in each episode is greater than in many modern paintings supposedly "about love". I would like to say "Bravo" to Clara Luchko and Mihai Volontir for their faith in men and women. Sincerely, sincerely. I believed in my youth, and after a quarter of a century I believe in the main characters and their love" (Purifier).

Heavenly Swallows. USSR, 1976. Director and screenwriter Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the operetta of the composer Florimont Herve "Mademoiselle Nitouche", libretto: A. Meljak, A. Millau). Actors: Andrey Mironov, Iya Ninidze, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Sergey Zakharov, Alexander Shirvindt and others. **TV premiere: December 19, 1976.**

Director Leonid Kvinikhidze (1937–2018) became famous for his television films "Collapse of Engineer Garin", "Straw Hat", "Heavenly Swallows", "June 31", "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" and others.

Film critic Irina Pavlova writes that "Heavenly Swallows" "once again shines a splendid pleiad of actors, all the same taste and style, so vital in staging a musical comedy. Young Georgian girl Iya Ninidze in the main female role is charming, charming, musical and plastic. For the first time, Kvinikhidze includes in the film massive musical and dance performances based on the American model. And the audience success is also a lot. But that former lightness, that magical feeling of celebration and play, which amazed me in Straw Hat, seemed to have disappeared somewhere" (Pavlova, 2010: 223).

One can probably agree that Iya Ninidze, strikingly similar to the young Audrey Hepburn, became the main decoy of "Heavenly Swallows", and TV viewers were happy to break away from everyday routine for several hours in order to then hum the memorable song tune...

This is evidenced by the reviews of today's viewers of "Heavenly Swallows":

"Great musical film. As if semi-airy. When I watch this film, I myself want to sing and dance. ... Everything is brilliant: camera work, music, dance numbers, a magnificent ensemble of talented actors. The very atmosphere of celebration and fun, the south, the sea, happiness, is so clearly felt, I have loved this wonderful film for many years. ... Incomparable pleasure" (Marina).

"A wonderful film ... I love films with singing and dancing both then and now. Very good actors" (Valera).

"One of the best Russian musicals. The plot has been qualitatively redesigned, all social implications have been removed. It is interesting that no one mentions that the music is not entirely original – themes from an old French film are used ... The music, vocals are practically perfect, they definitely fall into the genre" (Pavlusha).

"What else can be said about the film – a holiday, that it is magical and wonderful! The magic of music and theater. ... Here, just "ours play French life" brilliantly, art is not in debt! Great mood!" (Erna).

Hello, I'm Your Aunt. USSR, 1975. Director and screenwriter Victor Titov (based on the play by Brandon Thomas "Charley's Aunt". Actors: Alexander Kalyagin, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Mikhail Kozakov, Oleg Shklovsky, Mikhail Lyubeznov, Tamara Nosova, Tatyana Vedeneeva, Tatyana Vasilyeva, Galina Orlova, Valentin Gaft and others. **TV premiere: December 26, 1975.**

Director Victor Titov (1939–2000) staged twenty full-length feature films and series (among them – "Ilf and Petrov Rode in the Tram", "Hello, I'm Your Aunt!", "Open Book", "Adam Marries Eve", "Vacation at Own Account", "Life of Klim Samgin" and others), but the main popular among the mass audience was, of course, the comedy "Hello, I'm your aunt!".

Culturologist O. Osinovskaya believes that the film "Hello, I'm Your Aunt!" "permeated with the ideas of the carnival from the very first frames. A sense of carnivalism is born out of the black and white mock-documentary intro, and is then sustained throughout the film by the grotesque, stereotyped nature of the characters who look more like masks than real heroes. In this, the Soviet film is close to the American comedy "Some like it hot", in which there is also no desire to make heroes, especially the main ones, close to reality. Basically, the comic in cross-gender dressing is

based on strict adherence to stereotypes, the rules of male and female behavior, as well as deliberate violation of them. This refers not only to non-verbal behaviour (sighing, coquetry, ostentatious modesty as well as smoking cigars and drinking spirits, etc.), but also to verbal behaviour (deliberate raising of voice tone, avoidance of vulgarities and swearwords in 'female' speech as well as incoherence in the gender of collocations, etc.)" (Osinovskaya, 2008: 263).

However, ordinary viewers, as a rule, are not inclined to plunge into the problems of gender stereotypes and their violations, but simply react vividly to the comic component of the film and the bright acting works of Alexander Kalyagin, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Mikhail Kozakov and other actors.

It seems to me that Victor Titov was able to successfully stylize his film to match the genre features of the Great Dumb comedy and his Chaplin traditions. *And the film "Hello, I'm Your Aunt!" and today, almost half a century after the premiere, is of interest to viewers of different generations:*

"Usually, I don't have the habit of ecstatically watching the same films a hundred times. But I can't resist the next viewing of "Aunt" in any way! In general, there are very few good comedies, in my understanding of the word, and I love this genre extremely, so I am grateful to the creators of this film for the great pleasure they invariably deliver. Yes, from the point of view of directing, there is nothing special here, and the cinematography is not amazing, but – but!, this is absolutely not required here, this is just a very funny show, easy (as the genre requires) played out by our favorite actors. ... There's a sense of extraordinary pleasure with which it's all played out, no social heroes, no revolutionaries, etc., but just a soul-raising, positive performance to the delight of both the audience and the actors themselves, at least that's how I feel about it! (Valeria).

"This film, it seems to me, is timeless. I laugh heartily and believe what I saw one hundred percent. English humor with tints of Russian fun, magnificent inimitable grotesque acting – Kalyagin from Brazil, where there are many, many wild monkeys, Dzhigarkhanyan in a suit–pajamas, old soldier Kozakov with a broken heart, always "sober" and imperturbable Gaft – this movie will never become outdated and will always delight any spectator with a sense of humor" (Vasily).

"Hello, I'm Your Aunt!" – a cult comedy, no matter who says anything about the atmosphere on the set (not all films are made easily and simply, as it seems – looking at the final result of filming). This film is loved by the audience and brings joy and pleasure from the brilliant acting, music, directing and camera talent, and everything that makes up real, cult films" (Boris).

How the Steel Was Tempered. USSR, 1973. Directed by Nikolai Mashchenko. Screenwriters Alexander Alov, Vladimir Naumov (based on the novel of the same name by Nikolai Ostrovsky). Actors: Vladimir Konkin, Konstantin Stepankov, Fyodor Panasenkov, Natalya Sayko, Antonina Leftiy, Antonina Maksimova, Mikhail Golubovich, Lyudmila Efimenko, Sergei Ivanov, Vladimir Talashko, Les Serdyuk, Sergei Polezhaev, Elza Radzin and others. **TV premiere: November 3, 1973.**

Nikolai Mashchenko (1929–2013) directed 17 full-length feature films and TV series ("The Commissars", "How the Steel Was Tempered", "Gadfly", "The Paris Drama", "The Wedding with Death", etc.), but he was best known for two television adaptations – "How the Steel Was Tempered" and "Gadfly".

The Soviet film press greeted this adaptation of Nikolai Ostrovsky's novel with great enthusiasm.

Film critic Konstantin Shcherbakov published a "party-consistent" review of the television movie "How the Steel Was Tempered", emphasizing that "the director is not afraid of cruel, hard-to-see shots. It could probably have been a little softer, more subdued to show the hardships of Komsomol members on the construction of a narrow-gauge railway – Mashchenko does not agree to any softening. ... The unconditional and fundamental success of the film is the choice of the leading actor. In the individuality, in the very human nature of Vladimir Konkin, intransigence with gentleness, shyness with the ability to be frank and direct, no matter what the frankness, absorption in an idea – with the ability to feel, perceive all the colors and smells of life are

organically intertwined. ... In sharp contrast to the young bureaucrat and others like him, the communists Zhukhrai, Tokarev, Komsomol members, friends and classmates of Pavel are those who wasted themselves imprudently and avidly, burning up in the bright flame of the revolution. The ideas of the party, the ideas of Lenin, his moral character – that is what determined their lives, and these lives were beautiful” (Shcherbakov, 1974: 4–5).

True, for all the praises K. Shcherbakov still could not refrain from criticism, noting that "it happens, however, the direction changes the sense of proportion, and then the bold, artistically grounded sharpness of decisions gives way to naturalism, purely mechanical forcing heavy details" (Shcherbakov, 1974: 4).

In the same ideologically sustained spirit, Nikolai Mashchenko's film was praised by the film expert Ivan Kornienko (1910–1975), who was convinced that it was “an innovative work of cinema and television that develops and renews the best traditions of the Soviet cinematography and the first achievements of television art. Nikolay Mashchenko strives to make a deeply meaningful use of the experience of artistic classics and folk art. In the film “How the Steel Was Tempered”, permeated with truly socialist humanism, the director tells a story about the fate of a particular person, closely linking it with the history of the entire nation. The director's innovation is also revealed in the development of a figurative film language, in his striving for film narration imbued with high heroics, in his search for new forms of drama and pictorial and editing capabilities of the screen. The director, cameraman and actors, using a complex set of artistic means, create on the screen a romantic atmosphere of genuine events of the revolutionary years, emphasizing the motives that are in tune with our days” (Kornienko, 1975: 216).

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) had a more restrained assessment of the film. He wrote that in the film "How the Steel Was Tempered" dominated by "the stately slowness, the symbolism of color, the conditional solution of space, up to the frank development of what is happening on the lens – with an inevitable feeling of either theatrical convention or whether the conventions of old painting. The main character of the TV movie, staged by Mashchenko, as it were, absorbs all the maximalism, tension, drama of the revolutionary era. ... The biography of Paul is, as it were, canonized, its episodes cease to be everyday occurrences, but look already symbolic pictures, in an indicative litigation of naked entities. ... Korchagin, as played by the young Vladimir Konkin, is devoted to the revolution with his whole being, earnestly, passionately, fiercely, to the point of exaltation” (Demin, 1984).

In any case, this third (after the films of M. Donskoy and A. Alov and V. Naumov) attempt to film Nikolai Ostrovsky's novel became an event of the TV season and aroused interest – both among the press and TV viewers (and most importantly, it was liked by the authorities). That is why, a couple of years later, an abbreviated version of “How the Steel Was Tempered” was released into the cinema...

There are many supporters of this adaptation of the novel as interpreted by Nikolai Mashchenko today:

"A wonderful, truly patriotic film. And it's not about politics or revolution, but about true faith. Much more useful to young minds than all this American bullshit. ... A personality is built on such films, but it seems that this is exactly what no one needs” (Y. Varnachev).

“Strong and cool film. Vladimir Konkin gave the live Pavel Korchagin – Nikolai Ostrovsky – it is obvious that he was just like that. The last shot of the last episode – the chronicle of the real Ostrovsky – is simply amazing! His gaze ... he's not just a saint, there are so many things in this gaze. He suffered more than Jesus. Thanks to such people, the revolution of the hungry and the poor won, despite the millions of rich invaders. And they won the Patriotic War thanks to people like Pavka. ... Everything in the book and the film is true! Otherwise they would not have appeared. It's impossible to imagine! ... Half of those who covered the embrasure with their breasts performed a different feat – the book "How the Steel Was Tempered" was in the duffel bag. It is a fact. They were Komsomol members. To a large extent, thanks to them, we won the Great Patriotic War. This was Pavka's mission ... They fought and died for their homeland, for humanity, not for the system. In any, even the most noble system, sooner or later, parasites will crawl through and pervert it. The fact that we won the war is also the merit of Nikolai Ostrovsky. If someone really suffered, he knows: at such moments it is worth remembering those for whom it was even more

difficult, and strength appears. It is difficult to imagine who was more difficult than Korchagin–Ostrovsky” (Predator).

“The film amazed me more with its narrative pace, the peculiarity of the film story, the originality of the style, a kind of spirituality, and poetry. And it is also a film about honest, selfless people who believed in the revolution, in its cleansing power, in the freedom of spirit that it gives. No one then knew that it would not be possible to build such a new society due to the imperfection of human nature. V. Konkin, K. Stepankov, N. Stepanova play at the limit of acting possibilities. The whole film is built on close-ups, and you can't lie about them, you can't fake them. Great movie, but hard to watch, it hurts too much. ... It seemed to me that Vladimir Konkin managed to play Pavka Korchagin exactly as Nikolai Ostrovsky saw him. He has something of a young, still naive faith in higher ideals, something of the first fiery Komsomol members who are building a new life. I still cannot forget his smile, cheerful bright eyes and the word "brother"... The actor managed to convey the fanaticism that was characteristic of the younger generation. And his shout, shout ... is more directed at those same people from the socialist camp, at all opportunists, vulgar, liars, ruining, disfiguring the revolution. It is they who will carry out the repression in the 1930s. They will lead both the country and the socialist idea to collapse...” (Alexander G.).

“I love the film “Pavel Korchagin” very much. Vasily Lanovoy played great. But I love the film “How the Steel Was Tempered” more. This film was filmed in the 1970s. This film is as old as me. I started looking at it when I was little. And I always remembered and love Pavka Korchagin – Vladimir Konkin. ... Vladimir Konkin is a real Pavka Korchagin, brave, kind, sincere. And how handsome he is – those blue, like lakes, eyes, long luxurious hair. I loved him very much, always admired him. He dreamed of growing up and becoming like him both internally and externally. Both the hero and the actor. ... A wonderful film” (Valera).

“In my opinion, this film turned out to be thinner and deeper than the previous film adaptation. It is no coincidence that the script was written by Alov and Naumov, who were the directors of the film “Pavel Korchagin” with V. Lanovoy. Obviously, they themselves felt that their film turned out to be expressive, but somewhat straightforward. The material of the novel gave them the opportunity for a new, more in-depth reading. And the director Nikolai Mashchenko was able to talentedly embody their idea. Konkin ideally suited the role of the young idealist Pavka, and outwardly, perhaps, is more like Nikolai Ostrovsky than Lanovoy. ... Today, from a distance of time, after a reassessment of many former values, the story of Korchagin seems even more tragic. Because the idealists–romantics were pushed aside, and then destroyed by the cynical opportunists and careerists who had crept into power, always ready to bend under the next change in the party line. Korchagin himself (as well as the writer Ostrovsky) could well have come under another wave of repressions if he had not become a deeply disabled person” (B. Nezhdanov).

In Search of Captain Grant. USSR–Bulgaria, 1985. Director and screenwriter Stanislav Govorukhin (based on the novel by J. Verne “Children of Captain Grant”). Actors: Vladimir Smirnov, Nikolay Eremenko, Lembit Ulfsak, Tamara Akulova, Vladimir Gostyukhin, Boris Khmelnitsky, Marina Vlady and others. **TV premiere: May 1986.**

Stanislav Govorukhin (1936–2018) directed two dozen feature films, of which at least six were included in the thousand of the most popular films of the USSR.

“In Search of Captain Grant” – a Soviet–Bulgarian co-production was filmed in the key of a free interpretation of the famous novel by J. Verne. The main acting rate was made on the fans of Nikolai Eremenko, of whom he had a great many after the “Pirates of the XX century” in the USSR. Well, a wide audience was attracted, of course, by the desire to compare the old adaptation of the same novel with the new version.

Already in post-Soviet times, film critic Vladimir Gordeev wrote that today the film “In Search of Captain Grant” “technically outdated, compared to the best modern adventure films, the stunts and special effects don't look so hot. ... But the director wanted “adventure” so much that he remembered the existence of such a kind of adventure genre as the western. The third and fourth episodes are pure Western, but Soviet Western. And Govorukhin invented such plot lines, which were not even in the novel. ... The film is eclectic, unlike the novel. But, nevertheless, this is a good

adaptation. Because Govorukhin managed to convey the humanism of the heroes, their positivism, moral purity. The moral in the film is as unobtrusive as in the novel. Well, the spirit of adventure has been preserved (largely thanks to the amazing music of I. Dunaevsky, taken from "Children of Captain Grant" in 1936)" (Gordeev, 2008).

Many viewers today agree with this positive assessment of the film:

"The film is great. Like, already a big "girl", but every time I look with some truly childish pleasure. Great actors, very beautiful filming, brave, noble heroes, adventures and a happy ending. And no gibberish, anguish, self-flagellation. You just rest with your soul and believe that there is love, honor, nobility in the world, there are people who are ready to help and support in difficult times" (Tatiana).

"This masterpiece of Russian cinema... The actors did an excellent job with the task. ... I am grateful to the great geniuses who created this creation. Many thanks to them!" (Mickey)

"A stunningly beautiful film! I watched and watch it many times, and everyone – with pleasure! The actors are all great, the shooting on location, of course, is fabulous! ... In general, a film for many generations! Kind, honest, humane!" (Olga).

But there are, of course, the audience for whom the film "Children of Captain Grant" (1936) has always remained a reference:

"Well, I don't like this film, what can you do? Tightened, boring, many unnecessary details, and Verne's biography is absolutely out of place. And one Ulfsak will not pull the whole film on himself. ... The film for children and youth was exactly the first film that I love very much. It was there, in an hour and a half, unobtrusively and interestingly, the entire Verne novel was transferred to the screen without unnecessary details and details. I still watch it with interest and in one breath" (N. Volkova).

Investigation is Conducted by Experts. USSR, 1971–1989. Directed by Vyacheslav Brovkin, Yuri Krotenko, Victor Turbin, Gennady Pavlov. Screenwriters Alexander Lavrov, Olga Lavrova. Actors: Georgy Martynyuk, Leonid Kanevsky, Elza Lezhdey and others.

Vyacheslav Brovkin (1925–2016) directed 27 television films and serials, but the most famous of them was the series "Investigation is Conducted by Experts".

Yuri Krotenko directed mainly TV films (in total he had 13), but his most famous work also became the series "Investigation is Conducted by Experts".

Victor Turbin (1913–1984) only in 1981 joined the TV series "Investigation is Conducted by Experts" and in this project he shot only two television films ("From the Life of Fruits" and "The Midday Thief"). In total, he has ten TV films on his account.

Gennady Pavlov (1932–2001) directed 22 films, mostly on television. He joined the project "Investigation is Conducted by Experts" and filmed only two stories: "He's here somewhere" (1982) and "Mafia" (1989).

Vasily Davidchuk directed 12 TV films. In "Investigation is Conducted by Experts" he shot only one episode ("Boomerang").

Participation in a detective series stretching for almost two decades brought fantastic popularity to the actors Georgy Martynyuk (1940–2014), Leonid Kanevsky and Elza Lezhdey (1933–2001).

The investigator of the detective genre – film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) wrote about the phenomenon of the film "Investigation is Conducted by Experts" as follows: "At the heart of all of the Lavrovs' plays are bitter dramas that have arisen due to serious violations of the official and moral principles of our society. Their everyday life is very non-everyday, in real life this does not happen every day. Fortunately. Therefore, it would be wrong to say that the Lavrovs paint a broad social panorama. But, on the other hand, they try to touch on a new sphere in each of their new "business", and therefore, on the whole, the general picture of morals really turns out to be quite multicolored – commercial workers are replaced by artistic intelligentsia, a collective of taxi drivers – schoolchildren from disadvantaged families... , I repeat, the angle of view is specific and by virtue of the theme it highlights the shadow sides of everyday life, its sores, its difficulties, which, incidentally, gives the "Investigation is Conducted by Experts" an open journalism and a strong

educational impact. The conversation is about sad things. Where do criminals come from? What factors shape them? What makes people, often in no need of anything, possessing a well-known position and not at all stupid, turn into fraudsters? Are the social conditions or the poorly studied features of the psyche?

...Lavrov's serial teach strict adherence to the norms of socialist morality, their viewers go through a kind of law university, the professors of which are primarily three central characters, the very "Experts" – a word composed by their mocking colleagues from the initial syllables... But they are connoisseurs without quotation marks – really connoisseurs with competence, analytical mind, dedication, conviction of its necessity.

Perhaps the first success of the Lavrovs, which they justly should share with the artist Georgy Martynyuk, is associated with the creation of the image of Pal Palych Znamensky. Pal Palych is another hero of our time, ours. He is intelligent in the best sense of the word, he is the heir of the humane traditions of wonderful Russian lawyers, born of reality and glorified in literature. ... Znamensky – G. Martynyuk is always restrained, always serious, sometimes even too much, he looks with displeasure at the friendly pick of his colleagues. And at the same time, he cannot be denied a slight irony towards himself too. The state investigator must behave in an exemplary manner, and his irony gives this exemplary some flavor. ...

The second central character of the cycle is Criminal Investigation Inspector Alexander Tomin – Shurik, as his friends call him. This is also a man of excellent spiritual qualities, and much of what can be said about Znamensky also applies to Tomin – the same humanity, the same disposition towards people. Constant communication with the dregs of society did not kill these qualities in it. But at the same time, Tomin is the exact opposite of Znamensky: a man of explosive temperament, an artistic nature, constantly making fun of himself and others. If the unhurried Znamensky looks better at the investigating table, then Tomin cannot sit still for a minute. He is talented in knowledge of a wide variety of people, he can conduct a conversation on an equal footing in a variety of, sometimes incomparable audiences, while completing a task, he can become indistinguishable from the "environment"...

But the third third of experts, the forensic expert Zinaida Kibrit, played by Elza Lezhdey, is an image, in my opinion, not very successful for the creators of the picture, in any case, losing in comparison with the other two. ... What can you say about Kibrit? That she is a wonderful expert, a virtuoso expert. "Zinochka, you are a genius." But this is not a character trait, but professional training ...

Developing and enriching from series to series, and sometimes repeating themselves, the three experts are, so to speak, a constant component of the cycle. With regard to the variable, in particular, the criminals, here the authors were in a more difficult position – everything that they wanted to tell about them, they must fit into an hour, maximum two-hour program. But in each episode they have not only a new sphere of life, but also a new ethical problem. Fulfillment of civic duty, awakening the voice of conscience, the fruits of lack of spirituality, miscalculations of family upbringing, straightening bent or even broken souls – but it seems that I am listing the main themes of the Soviet detective in general. And in order to concretize them, one will inevitably have to turn to the material "carriers" of these problems, that is, again, to human images. The correctness of one art critic is confirmed, who categorically stated that character is a problem in itself. The multitude of such characters, problems, and make the cycle an extraordinary phenomenon in our art" (Revich, 1981: 146–153).

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) noted that "Investigation is Conducted by Experts" began as a purely adventure. In each episode, we saw an exhausting duel at the desk in the investigator's office. The criminal wagged, dodged, his weapon was sheep's skin, an imaginary alibi, fake invoices. The representative of the law Znamensky (G. Martynyuk) played a different game – he had moral impeccability, unconditional logic on his side, and also wonderful assistants, akin to fabulous craftsmen: Inspector Tomin (A. Kanevsky) easily changes his appearance, speaks in any jargon, penetrates unnoticed wherever it is necessary, and the expert Kibrit (E. Lezhdey) can restore what happened a long time ago and is carefully kept secret by blades, grains, by a fragment of a filling in a tooth. And the truth will triumph: the invoices will reveal erasures, the blackmailer will be caught red-handed, the simple-hearted gray-haired old man will be exposed as a savage swindler, and the foreign agent who decided to sit out in a criminal cell will be unmistakably separated from the

ordinary thieves and hooligans.

The structure of this transmission, however, turned out to be unstable. At first, the cycle developed like a chain of short stories. Then the short stories began to grow, so that a separate story no longer fit into the framework of one evening. ... And the rebirth is obvious. Steadily, with some relapses, but then with even more rapid leaps forward, there is an increase in private, everyday, home scenes in negative characters. Attempts at the same "animating" approach to positive characters were brief and are now resolutely abandoned. Moreover, the very role of the trinity of experts conducting the investigation is obviously emasculated, becoming official and functional. No longer is the interrogation the main thing, not the duel between the investigator and the criminal, not the clash of the law with the cunning of its violators. The interrogation is now either the beginning of everything or the end. The main thing is what precedes or follows the interrogation, than he responds there, among those lurking from justice. And this is what is characteristic: if in the scenes on Petrovka 38, the authors avoid ordinary prose, forcing the investigator, expert and operative to hold on every minute as if on stage, in the light of spotlights, then the opposing side acts in a dense layer of reducing everyday details, generously endowed with a rich set of characteristic details of behavior and well-being. However, it is understandable: "as it should" in a given image system does not allow options, but "as it should not" can be as varied as you like.

The villains, if you look closely at them, turned out to be much more difficult than they were at first. The masks of the people guarding the law remained masks, and the criminals gradually got hold of the second, third plane of feeling and behavior. For those first sets of "Experts", the unambiguity of the pawn on the drawn squares was good. Now the most interesting thing is that they, the villains and their henchmen, are not pawns at all. According to the plot, their hour has already struck, but they, not knowing this, divide the stolen, prepare new cases, hide the ends, have fun, philosophize. All of them will be side by side in the face of justice, but until it came to this, the scriptwriters had little protocol statements: "knew", "participated", "hid"... They spare no time and effort to reveal the true essence of each, those latent human impulses, which from one made a hardened criminal, from the other – took root, servile obsequious before an indulgent owner, and the third was generally pushed into this circle by accident, out of mental weakness, and now the eyes of his daughter, from whom you can no longer hide the truth, frighten him more terribly than death ... There was a bias, almost catastrophic for a multi-part transmission. Consciously or not, but in response to the viewer's social needs, the portrayal of the villains in "Experts" has become more interesting – more lively, multidimensional. And "ours," – representatives of a good beginning, remained at the same level as they were. The affairs that experts face have become much more serious and intricate, and they themselves, with the same vigilance on duty, strive for everything to pick up the simplest key in the form of two or three common platitudes. And they pick it up – that's what is most distressing.

Inside one series, before our very eyes, in fact, another is maturing, with different typological characteristics. This new series, in accordance with its own artistic objectives, is already embarrassed by the costs of adventure fiction – too steep tension of intrigue, "talking" evidence, canonical scenes of denunciation, etc. they are not inclined to shy away from including in the script fabric of motives and themes developed in newspaper and magazine problematic essays ... There is no sin here, rather, it would be worthwhile to welcome such an evolution of the genre education that once developed. The only problem is that "Experts", as they were before, have absolutely nothing to do in the newly-appeared structure. They are created to play by different rules and are organically incapable of discovering for themselves in the diversity of the surrounding reality something that is not yet completely clear, which has not become an axiom. Then, perhaps, having freed this wonderful trinity from an unbearable task for them, return Znamensky, Tomin and Kibrit to their direct business – to solving purely adventure, "chess" incidents – which, I think, could honestly entertain a multimillion audience with a solid periodicity – if not once a week, then at least once a month?" (Demin, 1981).

Viewers are still arguing about the series "Investigation is Conducted by Experts":

"Personally, this is what attracts me to this series. Watching it, as they say, non-stop, that is, one episode per evening, watching it as one big series, it is interesting to follow how the interiors and fashion change (after all, the actors were sewn every time according to the latest fashion), then

what chasing to get it, people. In general, it turns out like an encyclopedia. ... And one more thing, this time not very pleasant. Voluntarily or involuntarily, Olga and Alexander Lavrovs, with the help of directors, gradually "improved" negative characters from series to series. But since the end of the 1970s, complete hopelessness has begun to appear in the series – at the hydra of criminality are chopped off their heads behind their heads... but in their place new ones grow, even more toothy and poisonous. Negative characters come out with their philosophy of life, reflecting the atmosphere of acquisitiveness, grabbing, the desire to "be able to live" that was growing in Soviet society of late stagnation and early perestroika. Of course, in each episode, goodness triumphed, Znamensky uttered an edifying word, but... each time it sounded more and more unconvincing. ... In general, whether the authors wanted it or not, what corroded our society is growing from series to series. The positive aspect of the series is that there is practically nothing about the "native party". More precisely, there is, but just a little ... And we, by the way, did not find out whether Znamensky, Tomin and Kibrit were in the ranks of the CPSU. For which special thanks to the authors!" (Glory).

"I really love the whole series as a whole... By the way, it is interesting to pay attention to how the era influences the plots of films. Experts investigate cases related mainly to the theft of socialist property, as it was then called, all kinds of economic crimes. There are very few murders in the series. And even more so, no maniacs, serial killers... And if you take modern detectives, then what kind of detective is without murder?! In some of the current TV shows, "about cops" are generally murders" (Olga).

"The main thing is the literary basis of the scriptwriters Lavrovs. It is they who connect the cycle of their individual plays with a common high level, which makes this cycle attractive to this day. It shows social problems in society, gives real pictures of people, surroundings and relationships, so it does not have the usual strawberries necessary for a detective – a low-standard genre, divorced from reality, with a conventional artsy plot based on low passions – sex and violence, which blossomed now in lush color. There are no investigations of murders, drug trafficking, etc., beloved by detectives. In the USSR, killings were rare, but now they are daily and they are not even reported. And then it was an emergency for the whole city. Therefore, the Lavrovs, who really reflect reality in their plays, most of their plays are based on investigating the more common crimes of the time – theft and fraud. ... Some films make a painful impression, but this is most likely due to the poverty of the production, for which the television has clearly allocated little money. Filming is being carried out on real streets, and not in the best places of the city, in some poor apartments, offices ... Although now it is of great value – city life is filmed without embellishment. But nevertheless, in many cases it was too poor, even not always typical for that time" (Ekibas).

"What always touched me in the detectives of those years was the selection of actors: as soon as an intelligent person, there must be some kind of bastard thread :))) But in this case, one cannot say that the ideology devoured the film, after all, it is alive and –to his own dear" (Katarinka).

Irony of Fate or Enjoy Your Bath! USSR, 1975. Directed by Eldar Ryazanov. Screenwriters: Emil Braginsky and Eldar Ryazanov. Actors: Andrey Myagkov, Barabara Brylska, Yuri Yakovlev and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1976.**

Eldar Ryazanov (1927–2015) directed 26 full-length feature films, 15 of which ("Office Romance", "Incredible Adventures of Italians in Russia", "The Hussar Ballad", "Carnival Night", "Girl Without an Address", "The Station for Two", "The Old Robbers", "Give a Book of Complaints", "Beware of the Car", "Garage", "Zigzag of Fortune", "Quite Seriously", "Cruel Romance", "Forgotten Melody for the Flute", "Dear Elena Sergeevna") were included in the 1000 highest grossing Soviet films (and this is not counting his TV hits – "Irony of Fate" and "Say a Word about the Poor Hussar").

The stunning success of the lyrical comedy–fairy tale "Irony of Fate..." is unique, "this picture will never be interrupted by anything. Because its authors, by accidental insight, like everyone else in Russians, with drunken loops on white and fluffy ran into the secret formula of the Russian film, which since the beginning of perestroika, nasty non-drinkers in ties and thin-soled shoes have

been vainly trying to deduce it in a laboratory way nasty non-drinkers in ties and thin-soled shoes" (Gorelov, 2018).

True, we must make a reservation that "non-drinkers in ties" in 2007 still managed to release a sequel called "Irony of Fate. Continuation", which earned at the box office 55 million dollars, so it became clear: old film recipes can have a tangible box office effect in a completely different social era...

In the year that "Irony of Fate..." was released on television, Soviet film critics unanimously spoke of its fabulous nature: an article by V. Mikhalkovich (1937–2006) in the "Cinema Art" was titled "How a Fairy Tale Was Filed", and a review by Yu. Khanyutin (1929–1978) in the magazine "Soviet Screen" was named "Fairy Tales for Different Ages".

Justifying his generally positive opinion about the "Irony of Fate..." Y. Khanyutin wrote that "it is not for nothing that, in accordance with the requirements of a fairy tale... heroes are tested, their friendship, love, decency must withstand the test. This fairy tale is democratic" (Khanyutin, 1976: 4).

True, V. Mikhalkovich, in my opinion, very accurately noted that "the authors play a rather severe game with a fairy tale – they will tease, lure out, and immediately shy away at it with some everyday, everyday twists and turns, so that the fairy tale will shrink and hide again ... A story by E. Braginsky and E. Ryazanov that one should not trust old, long-learned fairy tales. Man needs fairy tales, but everyone must create them himself" (Mikhalkovich, 1976: 40, 46).

Journalist Anatoly Makarov wrote that "this is a film about love. On this common "love front", as Zoshchenko said, "Irony of Fate" stands alone. Ryazanov and Braginsky's film views love as a subtle psychological process, full of incomparable charm. The famous miracle of the birth of love is, in fact, the content of this picture. ... Andrei Myagkov plays amazingly the scene of his sudden violent awakening – in a situation that is quite suitable for the "theater of the absurd", while maintaining the absolute naturalness of his behavior. The success of the film is due to the already splendid duo of the leading actors. The hero of Myagkov is not only recognizable, he is typical of the mid-seventies, a modest intellectual, a romantic, a tireless worker who has kept a subtle and quivering soul in the bustle of endless worries. Polish actress Barbara Brylska, who starred in a good hundred films both at home and in many European countries, has become what is called a "movie star", and the hopes that in our film she will play one of her best roles seem to have come true. The very type of her appearance is excellently used by the director and cameraman: "a woman with the past", with fate, with her carefully guarded inner world, with a certain secret in her gaze... The emergence of a feeling, its truly unique "anatomy", movement that defies comprehension and control from dislike for mutual attraction are played by Brylskaya with filigree precision and sincere tact. The authors of the film were obviously aware that the most vulnerable place of their work is the direct dialogue of the characters, where the level of design and acting, the games do not always correspond to each other, – probably therefore, they enlisted the support of our wonderful lyricists – Tsvetaeva, Akhmadulina, Yevtushenko – their poems, set to music by Mikael Tariverdiev in his traditional manner, really give the picture an additional depth of poetic associations. They do not leave the viewer at all throughout the film. The love of the heroes makes us think about our own experienced love, and isn't this the phenomenon of art?" (Makarov, 1976).

In the XXI century, "Irony of Fate..." has become a reason for solid cultural studies. In particular, N. Leskis wrote that the popularity of "Irony of Fate..." "is largely due to the fact that Ryazanov used literary (Christmastide story) and cultural (semantic halo of alcohol) traditions that were important for the intelligentsia's consciousness of the 1970s; when brought into the medial sphere, they became universally valid. The seemingly unique success of the film "Irony of Fate..." is associated with the attraction of contexts, motives and genres that are elite for the contemporary cultural situation. It – in a rather atypical way – presents a model for resolving one of the key conflicts of the era – the creation of an absolutely private space that is not subject to any external social and ideological regulations" (Leskis, 2005).

This was followed by conclusions regarding the main socio-cultural message "Irony of Fate...": "The main social conflicts in the 1970s are born in the interaction of the official, public and private spheres of life. It is interesting that these conflicts do not arise due to excessive pressure from above, their reason is devaluation, the loss of an internal incentive to mobilize. The extinction of enthusiasm, in turn, leads to social depression, and the need for a miracle, the transformation of

the dreary surrounding reality, forms a social demand for such mass genres as, for example, the Christmas story. It is curious that hostility to the existing structure of society, social criticism in one form or another is stored in the memory of this genre" (Leskis, 2005).

Well, and of course, the young generation of the 21st century brought a sharp rejection of the "Irony of Fate..." in general, unthinkable in the Soviet press.

So N. Radulova, with the neoethical courage of overthrowing the idols of the past, pounced on Eldar Ryazanov's film in the following passage: "I'm afraid that I will soon be arrested for desecrating national shrines, but I absolutely do not like "Irony of Fate". I do not like three women wrestling a thirty-six-year-old overgrowth from each other. I do not like the overgrown itself, this New Year's sex symbol of the country with a crumpled face. And most of all I do not like how passionately we love all these heroes, how we believe that this is a real Christmas story in which good people make everyone around happy and eventually find their own happiness" (Radulova, 2007).

But, as they say, the caravan moves on... "Irony of Fate..." still attracts millions of viewers to TV screens every year.

On the portal "Kino-teatr.ru" about the "Irony of Fate" are 10 thousand viewers' responses.

Mostly positive:

"I can't imagine a single New Year's holiday without this film. For me personally, over the years, he has become close and dear. There has long been a tendency to criticize everything Soviet. "Irony of Fate..." also got it. Someone says that, they say, I'm tired of how much you can show, they would take something new, etc. But after all, nothing new can be removed. And the next New Year's premiere is sheer disappointment and regret about the lost time. When close people are nearby, the lights on the tree are burning, it smells of tangerines, a goose with apples is blushing in the oven, and from the TV you hear "I like that you are not sick with me...", your soul becomes warm and clear. I would venture to suggest that many will understand me" (Tatiana).

"I love this film very much. He gives the mood of a wonderful holiday. I love artists, heroes, plot, humor and, of course, music and songs that sound in it" (Natasha).

"Great movie! Even the memories of him make you smile and cheer up! Everything in it is organic: actors, music, and camera work!" (Hope).

Opponents of the "Irony of Fate", of course, are also encountered (mostly they are champions of "correct" morality):

"Imagine, I don't like this film. There are many explanations for this, but I will not expand on it. Here are just some of the arguments: exaggeration of the plot and actions of the heroes, playing on low-profile factors popular among the people (alcoholism), earthiness, philistinism of the film, the plot, heroes" (Zhuravushka).

"I really don't like the main idea of this film. In fact, impermanence is cultivated in the film. Suppose that after all the events described, everything ended as the viewer expects, i.e. Zhenya and Nadya got married. Then, in my opinion, the following question should naturally arise: this sudden outbreak of their "great love" how long will it last? Apparently, until Zhenya, being somewhere on a business trip or accidentally arriving in another city, does not meet another woman, after whom he immediately begins to drag, forgetting about Nadya. Or until some drunken and impudent stranger comes to Nadya's home, while Zhenya is absent there, who will immediately "win" over her. The filmmakers simply ignore such naturally occurring questions, pretending that they do not exist" (Hawke).

Jack Vosmyorkin is an "American". USSR, 1986. Directed by Evgeny Tatarsky. Screenwriters: Arkady Tigai, Anatoly Kozak, Evgeny Tatarsky (based on the story of the same name by Nikolai Smirnov). Actors: Alexander Kuznetsov, Lyubov Malinovskaya, Irina Rakshina, Lev Durov, Mikhail Vaskov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Nadezhda Smirnova, Alexander Galibin and others. **TV premiere: May 14, 1988 (three months earlier, it was screened in an abridged version).**

Evgeny Tatarsky (1938–2015) directed 14 feature films and TV series. The greatest popularity was brought to him precisely by television works – "Golden Mine", "Adventures of

Prince Florizel" and *"Jack Vosmyorkin is an "American"*. And this despite the fact that his "Charlotte's Necklace" was a great success at the box office.

... The action of the comedy *"Jack Vosmyorkin is an "American"* takes place in 1928, when Yashka (aka Jack) returns to the Russian village from America to become a successful farmer in the Land of the Soviets ...

Film critic Irina Pavlova wrote that "Jack..." was released by Evgeny Tatarsky brilliant, funny, dramatic, graceful: "fireworks of acting, fireworks of director's invention and ingenuity" (Pavlova, 2015).

But the film critic Lydia Maslova chided the authors for the ambiguity of the addressee to whom this story was intended (Maslova, 2001).

Ironically, the actor Alexander Kuznetsov (1959–2019), who played the role of this very "American", soon emigrated to the United States and even starred in Hollywood ("The Americans", "24 hours", "Into the West", "Alias", "Agent Red," "Space Cowboys," "Seven Days," "The Peacemaker", "Demolition Man", "The Ice Runner", etc.).

21st century viewers' opinions about the film "Jack Vosmyorkin is an "American" mostly approving:

"I liked the film. Funny and serious at the same time! Looks easy, in one go. And it becomes sad after watching it. But all this was then, yes, and now it is. And this is not a child's play, but adult life... The actors played the roles at the highest level. I liked the work of A. Kuznetsov very much. His hero turned out to be an optimist, hard worker, kind, with an open soul helps everyone" (Alfiya).

"The film once claimed the sarcasm and epic character of Zakharov's films: hints that everyone understood, sharp humor and banter. There was an understanding that for all the smiling and "improving relations" between the United States and Russia, our mentality is diametrically opposite, which was shown through the prism of Jack's misunderstandings of the reality going on around him. What seemed normal and logical to him, as for a person who grew up in the United States, in Russia turned out to be incomprehensible at the genetic, ethical level. In general, then it impressed my teenage brains" (Ragnit).

"When I watched this film for the first time, I was terribly funny, I perceived it as a comedy, watching which you can have a good time. And now I can't watch it calmly, I'm ready to burst out of anger: how much time has passed since the events that are shown there, but in our country nothing has changed – all the same slogans go around with slogans – bawlers, ready to take away from the one who produced something and earned money on it, and divide it among everyone, all the same dealers who buy everything from manufacturers for pennies, and then resell at exorbitant prices, do not let them on the market. ... And the film is, in fact, sad. But good" (Tikhonya).

June 31st. USSR, 1978. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Screenwriters Nina Fomina, Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the story by John B. Priestley). Actors: Natalia Trubnikova, Nikolay Eremenko, Vladimir Zeldin, Vladimir Etush, Lyudmila Vlasova, Alexander Godunov, Lyubov Polishchuk, Igor Yasulovich, Emmanuel Geller, Mikhail Kokshenov, Vladimir Soshalsky and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1978.**

Leonid Kvinikhidze (1937–2018) became famous for his television films "Collapse of Engineer Garin", "Straw Hat", "Heavenly Swallows", "June 31st", "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" and others.

At first, everything was fine with this musical fantasy called "June 31st": the premiere on New Year's holidays, the success with the audience ...

But on August 23, 1979 who played one of the roles in "June 31st" the famous ballet dancer Alexander Godunov (1949–1995), during the Bolshoi Theater tour in New York, asked for political asylum, and the film was immediately sent to the shelf for several years...

Alexander Godunov was not the first star of Soviet ballet to emigrate to the West, but unlike Rudolf Nureyev (1938–1993) and Mikhail Baryshnikov, his further fate turned out to be dramatic. At first he was accepted by M. Baryshnikov into the troupe of the American Ballet Theater, but in

1982, but after a quarrel with him he had to leave... Since 1985, Alexander Godunov began his career in Hollywood ("Witness", "Die Hard", etc.). The famous actress Jacqueline Bisset became his close friend. But, alas, in May 1995 he was found dead in his apartment...

Already in the 21st century, film critic Irina Pavlova wrote about "June 31st" as follows: "The Soviet viewer at that time did not need to be taught to" read between the lines. "June 31st" — a film that almost entirely consisted of what is "between the lines." For those who now watch this music movie only as a romantic drama about great love, it is difficult today to see in it what everyone who turned on the TV on New Year's Eve 1978 could easily see in it. ... And yet the story of love, finding its way through time and distance, is more important. ... The music for this fairy tale was written by Alexander Zatsepin, creating a musical image of a huge Universe through which lovers need to break through, composing exquisite musical themes for the ancient Parador and ironic hits to characterize today's reality" (Pavlova, 2010: 223).

The views of the 21st century viewers about "June 31st" are far from unambiguous:

"This is a wonderful, lyrical picture, a fairy tale for adults, with amazing music, great acting and dancers' plasticity. You can see rare footage with Alexander Godunov, who had such a tragic fate. I don't think this film will ever get old" (M. Morozova).

"The film is amazing, to be honest, at one time made a much stronger impression than the work of Priestley itself. The songs are the most charming! It will never become outdated, I always review it with pleasure" (Elina).

"I also really love this film. What are the actors! And the music! I recognize the songs only performed by Antsiferova" (Tatiana).

"I personally didn't like it: the plot, the actors, the music. I do not like it when waving hands and feet is passed off as a dance, and the air and aspiration are called singing. In one of the scenes, the main character complains that all the suitors are bad for her. One of them, she said, has empty eyes. We have not seen all these gentlemen, but she has empty eyes. The entire film the girl looks straight ahead, and nothing else. Demonstrates texture. The texture, of course, God forbid everyone, but looking at it for two hours in a row — and you still wonder why I'm bored? ... Other actors have nothing to play. The actors are good, but the characters are none, sucked out of the finger" (Anyasha).

Laterna Magica. USSR, 1976. Directed by Evgeny Ginzburg. Screenwriter Boris Purgalin. Actors: Lyudmila Gurchenko, Spartak Mishulin, Nikolai Karachentsov, Yuri Volyntsev, Yevgeny Morgunov, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Gennady Khazanov, Valentin Nikulin, Lyubov Polishchuk, Natalya Selezneva, Vakhtang Kikabidze and others. **Premiere on TV: January 1977.**

Evgeny Ginzburg (1945–2012) directed 25 films, performances and musicals. He mainly worked in television, over and over again chaining millions of viewers to home screens.

On Easter night on the Soviet Central Television the premiere of the musical comedy "Laterna Magica" with a whole constellation of popular actors took place. Evgeny Ginzburg built his bright show as a parody history of world cinema, reminding film fans of the musical "Funny Girl" with Barbara Streisand, the "Serenade of the Sun Valley", Chaplin's masterpieces, westerns, "Fantômas" and "Fanfan Tulip", the comedy "The Law Is Law" with Fernandel and Toto. The film featured "as it were Sophia Loren" (Lyubov Polishchuk) and musical hits from the films "Jesus Christ Superstar", "The Godfather" and "Love Story", which were then inaccessible to the Soviet public. Moreover, Evgeny Ginzburg dared to complete his musical with the legendary Beatles' "Let It Be", sung in a free translation into Russian.

Agree, for Soviet television in 1970s it was very bold!

And, probably, we can largely agree with these audience reviews published on the Kino-teatr.ru portal:

"In general, all these TV-benefit are masterful banter, a kind of outlet in the then atmosphere of television, where almost everything was not available. Parodies and copies were all the more successful, since not all viewers could properly study the originals. And this despite the fact that all this without any special effects was molded from improvised means, as they say, on the knee. But

the special effects were perfectly replaced by the great sense of taste and great humor of the authors and performers. I can imagine how the authors had fun while writing the texts" (Slava).

"In an era of total scarcity, including Western music, the film was what is called a "breath of clean air". ... But I still enjoy it, because now it is the same sip, but already in the midst of the smog of the current stupid pop!" (Reser).

"The most magnificent musical with unforgettable, witty numbers. Especially about "Fantômas" with Commissioner Juve performed by the young Khazanov. The ability to make a high-quality thing with very modest means is amazing, in contrast to the current one-off shows, where a lot of money is spent on decorations, but inside is squalor" (Oleg).

"I have not seen a more bourgeois Soviet TV tree than this "Laterna Magica". He's all on imported songs with invented Russian lyrics. This is some kind of direct propaganda of Western TV cabarets. ... In short, if the authors of all the compositions had sued for payment for copyright, the Soviet creative association "Screen" would have been ruined to the ground" (D. Jump).

But there are, of course, the audience who remained dissatisfied with the "Laterna Magica":

"The film is as poor as Weber's music. Is that for the "era of total deficit" will come down" (Clock).

"Some kind of cheap gag. They cooked up on the basis of the hits of that time ... re-songs in Russian" (Baltiets).

Life of Klim Samgin. USSR, 1988. Directed by Victor Titov. Screenwriters Alexander Lapshin, Victor Titov (based on the novel of the same name by Maxim Gorky). Actors: Andrey Rudensky, Lenya Gorelik, Elena Solovey, Ernst Romanov, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Sergey Bekhterev, Sergey Makovetsky, Andrey Kharitonov, Sergey Koltakov, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Gluzsky, Natalia Egorova, Natalia Gundareva, Alexey Zharkov, Irina Mazurkevich Evgenia Glushenko, Svetlana Smirnova, Alexander Galibin, Alexander Kalyagin, Andrey Boltnev, Victor Proskurin, Valentin Gaft, Vladimir Soshalsky, Vsevolod Shilovsky, Alexey Loktev, Igor Vladimirov, Natalia Danilova, Irina Rozanova and others. **TV premiere: March 28, 1988.**

Victor Titov (1939–2000) directed twenty full-length feature films and series (among them – "Ilf and Petrov Rode in the Tram", "Hello, I'm Your Aunt!", "Open Book", "Adam Marries Eve", "Vacation at Own Account", etc.), but the main work of his life, in my opinion, was an excellent adaptation of Gorky's novel "Life of Klim Samgin", where the main role was played by the then debutant Andrei Rudensky.

The outstanding literary critic and film critic Lev Anninsky (1934–2019) wrote in the year of the release of "Life of Klim Samgin" that "an event has taken shape. Not just television – general cultural. Not screen, but from the area of our spiritual reality. ... And, of course, the decisive "hit", the decisive, fundamental embodiment – Andrei Rudensky in the role of Klim Samgin. Nothing from "a man in a case", nothing from that caricature, once sketched by Lunacharsky with the help of Dobuzhinsky, where Klim sounds like "a wedge: something narrow, clammy, blind, quietly vile, selfishly calculating and mediocally inflated. Rudensky ignores this caricature. He plays two themes: nobility and lack of reaction; he is inhibited, blocked; sometimes it seems that he is hiding something (behind the glasses – the face of Christ); sometimes you see that this is not a face, but a mask, and finally you understand that this is a face worn by the rules of the mask. Sanity amidst madness. The only chance to save face in a Bosch masquerade is to pretend that it is a mask. The only chance to survive in the midst of cheating is to pass off honesty as one of the forms of cheating. ... A person is dissolved in a situation, he accepts it as a lot. He testifies to her. Although there is no one to testify, because everyone is involved. This is the concept of the film" (Anninsky, 1988: 17).

Today you understand how strongly and succinctly was expressed in the film "Life of Klim Samgin" the timeless essence of the crisis of society and the crisis of the intelligentsia as its intellectual part. And over the years this film has not lost its relevance at all...

The views of the 21st century viewers about "Life of Klim Samgin" differ significantly.

"Pro":

"An ingenious film. Great material from Gorky's novel, accents are caught. Rudensky is graceful. The most beautiful Soviet actors. It is bitter that such art is no longer possible" (Larisa).

"A wonderful film, a wonderful ensemble of actors, one of the best screen adaptations in general and the best screen version of Gorky" (Svetlana).

"One of my favorite TV series. The era is very well conveyed, the furnishings, make-up, costumes, actors are perfectly matched – beyond praise, each character is a living person, with his own character and destiny. Klim Samghin is perceived very interestingly – he really is a stranger to everyone, he just observes from the outside, but does not live a full life. And he himself does not know what he wants. While those around them simply throw themselves headlong into revelry, into revolution, into love – Klim only coldly analyzes their behavior. It's very hard to have such a character!" (Lina).

"The great film ... And the great work of Gorky ... Only such works can form a thinking personality. This film should be watched many times at different ages, and each time, taking into account their own life experience, a new meaning will open ... New phrases and thoughts of the characters will become clear. I'm 35, so it turns out that I watch a movie once every seven years, and every time – voraciously and with admiration, like a student at an interesting lecture. A wonderful work about a great unique layer of Russian society – about the Russian intelligentsia... About erudite, educated, thinking people. They were destroyed / chased away ... without them, Russia has become obsessed and worn out" (Alexey).

"Every emerging personality faces the same problems as Samghin. Initially, he plays, believes, tries to create a role for himself, to know the world, to feel the great word of the people and even to believe in the power of his day. But, not having, as before, noble nests and estates, which make it possible to float with the flow of life and be sybaritic in spirit, to bend our line, we have to break much earlier (everyone will probably understand what I mean). All good ideas disappear ... If such an analyst with a tough character and constantly thinking like Klim Samgin (and such a type, undoubtedly, by Gorky, and at the same time by Titov and Rudensky is displayed with crystal accuracy and convexity) is not able to solve the main questions for himself, he is not able change nothing, influence nothing ... The film is underestimated ... to be honest, I never saw the best adaptation of the classics" (Ruhr).

"Contra":

"I don't like the film "Life of Klim Samgin"... I started watching it and dropped it, I didn't like it. It is very sad. ... And I, frankly, am not happy with Gorky either" (Valera).

Long Road in the Dunes. USSR, 1981. Directed by Aloizs Brenčs. Screenwriters Dmitry Vasiliu, Oleg Rudnev. Actors: Lilita Ozolia, Juozas Kiselyus, Romualdas Ramanauskas, Eduards Pavuls, Karlis Trencis, Arijis Geykins, Lydia Freimane, Aare Laanemets, Indra Burkovska, Dzidra Ritenberga, Evgeniy Zharikov, Lyudmila Paula Talvik. **TV premiere: June 2, 1982.**

Aloizs Brenčs (1929–1998) directed 20 full-length feature films and TV series, of which eight were included in the 1,000 highest-grossing Soviet films. The drama series "Long Road in the Dunes" is one of the few films by Aloizs Brenčs, filmed outside the detective genre.

"Long Road in the Dunes" attracted viewers not only with a fascinating plot and vivid acting work, but also by the fact that the author of the film, the time span of which spanned several decades, touched upon very painful themes of the story ...

Viewers still remember this series with a kind word:

"An amazing picture. When difficult times come, it is good to watch movies like these. They inspire hope" (Tatiana).

"Great movie. There is always a lump in the throat when watching. The film was shot on the strings of the soul. Both the artists and the whole team are beyond praise" (Irina).

"The film is amazing! Real, strong, beautiful love, tragic life story... The film is tender, touching and sincere. Leaves a nagging feeling. Beautiful, unusually feminine, the heroine performed by Lilita Ozolini, music that penetrates into the very heart" (V. Nikitchenko).

"A very good movie. Not a single one hundred percent negative character. All are shown by more or less people with their own advantages, disadvantages, weaknesses. Moderate passions, but

deep feelings. The restraint inherent, according to generally accepted clichés, to the northern peoples, gives a special charm. ... The musical theme is beyond competition! Simply the best thing Pauls' genius has ever created. Respect" (Wing).

Major "Whirlwind". USSR, 1967. Directed by Evgeny Tashkov. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Vadim Beroev, Anastasia Voznesenskaya, Victor Pavlov, Evgeny Teterin, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Vladimir Kenigson, Alexander Shirvindt, Igor Yasulovich, Vladimir Osenev, Yuri Volyntsev and others. **TV premiere: November 8, 1967. In the film distribution – July 8, 1968.**

Evgeny Tashkov (1926–2012) directed 11 films, of which three ("Thirst", "Come Tomorrow" and "Crime") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films. And this is not counting his main hits – the television series "Major "Whirlwind" and "Adjutant of His Excellency."

A. Muradov and K. Shergova believe that "Major Whirlwind" – "the film is a transition from a work of fiction, striving as much as possible to documentary, to an adventure and predominantly spy detective, which has only some relation to real events from the recent past. It is this "transitional" state that is reflected in the director's decisions. ... "Major" Whirlwind "is the first film about a successful historically reliable operation of the Soviet special services, based (but not repeating word for word) on real events, and its protagonist is the first in a series of fictional heroes – scouts of the Great Patriotic War. Changing details and meaningful facts is a step towards fictional stories, where war is used as a backdrop for the development of a new genre. It is too early to talk about a complete rejection of the "documentary", but we can state the choice in favor of the "artistic" over the historical" (Muradov, Shergova, 2019: 27, 33).

The controversy around "Major "Whirlwind" among the audience does not subside to this day.

Someone thinks that this is "a wonderful, exciting and very warm film. It looks so captivating that it is difficult to tear yourself away from the screen" (A. Grebenkin).

And someone checks the plot of the film with historical facts and pays attention to the "bloopers" and recalls that "Semenov is a famous master of negligence. He worked quickly, there was no time to double-check. Yes, and there were many fewer flea catchers in those days, and he raised interesting topics, everything was forgiven. Now the inconsistencies are starting to creep out and this is normal" (Nemaccain). Or writes that "in the film there are still many theatrical conventions of that time. Before the radio operator had time to go on the air, they were taking direction finding and with a rocket speed a company of soldiers on a heavy truck was right there. They take the radio operator, and Whirlwind safely hides in the bushes and is not even looked for. ... Even the escape of the radio operator "from the restroom thanks to the boards without nails" is at the level of a school play. And the ending of the film is a total poster. The cable is blown up, then the Germans attack, ours shoot back... everyone dies heroically, but the Germans panic-stricken run, because at that very moment the Red Army with tanks advances" (Yuri).

In any case, "Major "Whirlwind" was a notable milestone in the detective and intelligence genre of Soviet cinema, with interesting acting and solid direction. And the next TV movie by Evgeny Tashkov, made in the same genre – "Adjutant of His Excellency" – had even greater audience success and resonance in the press.

Mary Poppins, Goodbye. USSR, 1983. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Scriptwriter Vladimir Valutsky (based on the story by Pamela Travers). Composer Maxim Dunaevsky. Actors: Natalia Andreichenko, Anna Plisetskaya, Philip Rukavishnikov, Larisa Udovichenko, Albert Filozov, Lembit Ulfsak, Oleg Tabakov, Zinovy Gerdt, Leonid Kanevsky, Ilya Rutberg, Irina Skobtseva and others. **TV premiere: January 8, 1984.**

Director Leonid Kvinikhidze (1937–2018) became famous for his television films "Collapse of Engineer Garin", "Straw Hat", "Heavenly Swallows", "June 31", "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" and others.

Film critic Irina Pavlova reasonably notes that in the film "Mary Poppins, goodbye" "everything that so captivated by "Straw Hat" returned to the screen again – the atmosphere of celebration and play, irony and mischief, a sense of the momentaryness of what is happening on the screen. That lightness and weightlessness returned, which was almost impossible to expect from a director, who not so long ago tasted the bitterness of the "forbidden", who had just tasted the bitterness of a previously unknown half-success. ... The director created his fabulous England in the "Mosfilm" pavilions with the same impeccable sense of style... "Mary Poppins, goodbye" – the most carnival of Kvinikhidze's films, the most theatrical. ... Nobody even tries to pass off all musical numbers as "fragments of life", their convention is demonstrative, both the characters and the director himself play it. ... Here the exclamation "it doesn't happen!" Cannot arise, because it really doesn't happen, and no one is going to hide it" (Pavlova, 2010: 224).

Stylish, mischievous play of Natalia Andreichenko and Oleg Tabakov, real musical hits of Maxim Dunaevsky... All this made the film "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" truly cult.

This is indicated, for example, by such viewer reviews:

"I am already 24 years old, but this film leaves me in a happy awe to this day. Very, very kind, fabulous in a good way, and what songs! The film can be watched by everyone: both adults and especially children. You watch it – and you feel warm in your soul. Thanks to the creators for this wonderful film!" (Aliya).

"I love the film very much. Natalia Andreichenko is just lovely. The lady is perfect in every way. For me, for many, she is the real that neither is Mary Poppins. I watched the film many times. I look now. I adore all his actors" (Valery).

"My favorite childhood film... And most importantly, it doesn't get boring. Natalia Andreichenko is insanely good in the image of Mary Poppins, what a posture, what a look, a smile, hats suit her very much... The main feature of this film, its songs" (Bella).

But, of course, there are also viewers who treat Leonid Kvinikhidze's film differently, believing that "The choice of the main character is off target. Instead of a tall, thin, awkward with long arms, legs and piercing little blue eyes, a prim Englishwoman who completely unexpectedly pleases children with miracles, there appears a sweet girl, somewhere coquettish, who is trying to be strict" (Miriam) and "the film itself is more reminiscent of a clear structure than a soulfully told story ... Mary–Andreichenko is deliberately cold, with a great deal of narcissism and strange claims to children!" (Anna).

Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed. USSR, 1979. Directed by Stanislav Govorukhin. Screenwriters Arkady and Georgy Vayner (based on his own novel "The Era of Mercy"). Actors: Vladimir Vysotsky, Vladimir Konkin, Sergei Yursky, Alexander Belyavsky, Victor Pavlov, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Zinovy Gerdt, Natalia Fateeva, Leonid Kuravlyov, Svetlana Svetlichnaya, Evgeny Evstigneev, Ekaterina Gradova, Valeria Zaklunnaya, Larisa Udovichenko, Evgeny Shilunnaya Alexander Milyutin, Andrey Gradov, Natalia Danilova, Alexey Mironov, Vsevolod Abdulov, Evgeny Leonov–Gladyshev, Ivan Bortnik, Stanislav Sadalsky, Vladlen Paulus, Vladimir Zharikov, Yunona Kareva, Nikolay Slesarev, Tatiana Tkach, Alexander Abdulov, Natalia Premier Krachkovskaya and others. **Premier on TV: November 11, 1979.**

Stanislav Govorukhin (1936–2018) directed two dozen feature films, of which at least six were included in the thousand of the most popular films of the USSR. Detective "Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed" is probably the most famous work of this director.

The series "Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed" was positively received by both the press and the audience.

For example, film critic Vsevolod Revich (1929–1997) wrote about this film as follows: "We have already wondered whether it is possible to create a full-blooded character if the authors, director, actor have only a narrow "detective" foothold, if the hero is always in the circle of purely professional concerns, that is, he constantly catches criminals. We were even inclined to believe that it is desirable to show the hero in other guises, for example, in love. But then an excellent actor comes and proves by deed: you can limit yourself to portraying only one professional activity. In no

other life is Zheglov shown to us, and he has no other life – no family, no love. He is all in work, it is his life – and this is a sufficient basis for solving the creative task set by the artists. And yet how complicated what an ambiguous character appears before us! ... But suddenly it turns out that the situation with Zheglov is not so simple, and Sharapov at some point begins to look like a straightforward moralist. The skill shown by V. Vysotsky consists in the fact that his Zheglov is always sincere, that contradictory features are present in the character of the hero at the same time and seem to flow from each other. His harshness is the flip side of kindness, and his bias is his hatred of murderers. No, we are not making excuses for Zheglov, but we cannot fail to see that his service zeal is not explained by the search for an overbearing affection. In addition, he is not only selflessly devoted to the cause, he also knows how to do it. He is not only courageous, but also smart, resourceful: it is Zheglov who comes up with how to rescue Sharapov from a seemingly completely hopeless situation” (Revich, 1983).

However, further Vsevolod Revich also expressed his claims to this television film, noting that in it “Sharapov utters many correct phrases, behaves impeccably and even loves a positive and beautiful police woman, who, by the way, in the novel – I cannot resist comparison – dies at the hands of a bully, and this ending is much stronger than that touching, Christmas picture – Varya with a baby, – which the creators for some reason considered it necessary to complete their picture. But back to Sharapov: the individuality in this image – alas! – not. Sharapov, as he is shown, can be transferred without changes to the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, he is ahistorical and unconvincing. This is not only a flaw in the director, but also a lack of acting skills, which is especially noticeable in the last, most intense episode, where the action is entirely centered around the hero Vladimir Konkin” (Revich, 1983: 94–95).

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) noted that in “Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed” “a novice militia worker (and before that a frontline intelligence officer) Sharapov could be the brother of investigator Znamensky from the “Experts”. The same clarity of ideas about life, the same everlasting clarity of the distinction between good and evil, the same complete detachment from everything vague, doubtful, and wrong. In highlighting his previous roles, V. Konkin plays Sharapova with an ideal nature, capable of self-sacrifice, but not capable of a compromise between high life principles and the prosaic reason of the moment. However, in the context of the entire narrative, such straightforwardness, sung in “The Experts”, looks naive, divorced from life. Older and more experienced colleagues of Sharapov laughingly answer his hasty axioms: they say, if this is a thief, we take him, take him for interrogation, and all is short. And tossing a purse into a criminal's pocket, even if it was stolen by him, but found elsewhere ... Is that worthy? Is it okay? How can you do that? ...

Here the laughter should end. The filmmakers, like Sharapov, are also convinced that this is unworthy, unacceptable. Only, unlike their yet inexperienced hero, they know another thing: it was so. And here is the main thing that gives the shots of the adventure story not at all an adventure drama, but a harsh and bitter intonation of thinking about the most important things today.

Director S. Govorukhin ... not so much colored the detective scheme with additional shades, but rethought it, dissolving it in everyday trifles, served without an accent, with textured, everyday descriptive authenticity. True, he muffled the self-playing juiciness of some of the novel's half-sketch sketches. But even in this form, the film noticeably exceeded the standard of lifelike usual for our detectives. This was the first component of luck. It is not brave detectives who catch dashing raiders, but tired, poorly dressed, half-starved people pursue other people who have decided at the expense of their neighbors to escape from the common troubles of the post-war hard times. Not rock, not chromosomes, not conventional, as in chess, the division into black and white paved the line between those who seek and those who are hiding. This border is mobile, and in the will of the persecutor to overstep it with all the ensuing consequences or, tightening the belt, endure, remaining on the correct, on the human side. We see a selfish man, a coward, dressed in a police uniform and betraying his comrades. And in the eyes of pickpockets, swindlers, the Byronically mysterious Fox (played by A. Belyavsky, perhaps, too grounded and simple) reads not only “frenzied hatred”, but often hunger, fear, confusion before tomorrow, and contempt for his own filthiness, and pity for this dirty self, and hope, now timid, now desperate, that someone, even Captain Zheglov, will listen, understand – let him then seal what he deserves, but first he will understand, will get into the situation ... dressed in a police uniform and betrayed his comrades.

The dramatic material rich in shades allowed the performers sometimes, even on a small patch of one episode, to create a figure that sinks into memory and is rich in black and white contrasts. To which Zheglov is a master at picking up keys to other people's souls, but he sometimes stops and shrugs.

Vladimir Vysotsky in this role, which turned out to be the last for him, is the film's greatest success. It becomes bitter at the thought of what and how he could still play. ... Zheglov has become a small summit of a giant iceberg, the surroundings of an intimate theme. The messenger of the law, he trumps a half-rogue argo, knows how to speak with any of this criminal shantrap, and achieves goals in his righteous deed in not entirely righteous ways. These poles created a rare potential drop. Atmospheric electricity, poured into the fabric of the narrative, here condensed to the density of ball lightning, which can explode every minute. When Zheglov is meek, this is a catch, if he is affectionate, then ominously, irony is sure to be hidden in his solemn phrase. And then out of the blue, an all-crushing rage will suddenly flare up in all the strength of the male character. No wonder that with such a register of mental states, he has his own approach to each suspect and suspect, for each – his own reasons. It seems that at times he even replays, reveling in the opportunity with anyone to find the most understandable language. But at the same time, to the astonishment of his young partner Sharapov, he seems to love these lost sheep, this criminal small fry, in his own way. For them he has some kind of sympathy – not like those others with heavy pistols. Those Zheglov takes aim immediately, aims evil and mercilessly. Criminal this small fry. For them he has some kind of sympathy – not like those others with heavy pistols. Those Zheglov takes aim immediately, aims evil and mercilessly.

And here's the trouble – the charming and all-powerful Zheglov was wrong. The one in whose fault he was one hundred percent sure, with whom he spoke without ceremony, as with a criminal, turned out to be the victim of a clever forgery. The interrogations of the engineer Borisov (S. Yursky) are brilliant examples of a dramatic acting duet, which unfolds taking into account the purely television characteristics of perception. The illusion of immediacy is so strong that you are eager to pull up on both: why get excited, you both are nice, good people ... Yes, Zheglov is doing the wrong thing. In the novel, this is emphasized more than once or not twice, but, one wonders, which of the heroes we remember always did the right thing? And the difference between the correct basis and the incorrectness of expression becomes the main thing in the depiction of this character" (Demin, 1981).

Already in post-Soviet times, film critic Lilia Tsibizova, highly appreciating "Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed", wrote that "in the atmosphere of a large number of propaganda clichés of the late 1970s, a film appeared without the slightest hint of ideological anguish and hysteria. The events of 1945 are recreated in all the fullness of everyday details: thoughts, dreams, joys and sorrows of people who survived the war and are only getting used to peaceful everyday life. The lack of heroic pathos, so often found in works about the war, helps to understand the heroes, empathize with them, makes them modern and close to the viewer. One cannot ignore the strong detective story about the seizure in post-war Moscow of one of the most brutal Black Cat gangs. ... The film, in which the director brought together the best Russian actors... It did not become a cinematic illustration of a work of fiction, but took on a life of its own and became a classic of the genre, inspiring contemporary filmmakers to create their own works in the form of stylizations of the postwar era" (Tsibizova, 2010: 127).

And I agree with the film critic Nina Sputnitskaya – in this film, Vladimir Vysotsky "gave" his irrepressible temperament, charm. ... Thanks to this, the rude, sometimes law-breaking employee of the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department has become a true national hero in the mass consciousness. Perfectly knowledgeable of the criminal environment, its "charter" and vocabulary, an experienced security officer is in no way inferior to the main character of the movie – a newcomer to the criminal investigation department, former intelligence officer Sharapov. It is impossible to imagine another performer Zheglov today, the drawing of the role seems to coincide with the very nature of the actor. But in fact, Vysotsky made significant efforts to overcome the declarative, schematic character of the character. ... At the Weiners, Zheglov skillfully fights against banditry, but is absolutely alien to any doubts, rude, uncompromising. With Vysotsky, Zheglov became softer, more human than in the novel. Zheglov became controversial due not so much to the acting technique as to the personality of the performer himself" (Sputnitskaya, 2008).

"Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed" is one of my favorite detective stories, and it's nice to know that it is not forgotten today, and millions of viewers again and again review (or discover) this best work of Stanislav Govorukhin...

For example, this film by S. Govorukhin has already received 22 thousand comments on the kino-teatr.ru portal!

These are mostly rave reviews:

– "This film is higher than ratings and ratings, it is eternal, it has no age. I will never forget the premiere screening, when our family (like millions of other families) literally clung to the screen, they were afraid to move – God forbid we miss something" (Tatiana).

– "I admire the talent of Stanislav Govorukhin. This man was able to create a real folk film from the history of the life of the police employees in the postwar year. What a constellation of actors! And how did Govorukhin manage to turn individual talents into a talented team? Honor and praise to him! Bravo! An excellent script by the Weiner brothers in which everything is in place and on time. A wonderful movie..." (Andrey).

– "I love this movie. Looked repeatedly and will watch. All the actors play great. Vysotsky, of course, is a leader, but the rest are just a class" (Lena).

– "The film is undoubtedly one of the best in our cinema. I would even say – a masterpiece. Every time you look like the first time. And all because the actors play flawlessly. I just admire Vladimir Vysotsky when I watch a film – what talented our actors are! It is a pity that nowadays there are few such good films being shot. They make you worry, and rejoice, and cry. The last scene is especially heartwarming (Varya hugs her adopted baby) – a scene without words, but how touching!" (Tanya).

But there is, of course, a fly in the ointment:

– "Vladimir Konkin is initially weak, but to be honest, a mediocre actor. His whole trouble is that he did not pass the test for artistry even in the film "How the Steel Was Tempered" re-screened by the Ukrainian director Nikolai Mashchenko. The film itself turned out to be frankly weak, like all the production of the A. Dovzhenko film studio, and Korchagin of Konkin after the work of V.S. Lanovoy – well, not at any gate! A slug in a case, not a revolutionary. Re-screening films, as time shows, does not always improve their quality. ... And Vladimir Konkin would like to wish him good health, mindful of his sick heart and, finally, leave this profession, it is not for him" (Andrey).

"For me, this film is an example of how you can spoil a good literary source by translating it on the screen. The film was planned as a seven-part film, but it was narrowed to five episodes. In one of the editions of the novel there is a photo: Sharapov and Levchenko in a trench at the front. This episode, the prologue, was filmed, but did not get into the film, which is why the viewer does not understand the duel of their views on the "raspberry" by the hunchback. The director has collected a constellation of popular and beloved actors, without going into the question too much: do they fit in type? For example, Vysotsky wanted to see Ivan Bortnik in the role of Sharapov, but Govorukhin assigned the latter only the role of a "blotter". The hunchback seemed more terrifying, while Dzhigarkhanyan was some kind of home, sitting for himself, and you know, stringing sauerkraut. ... Personally, I generally did not like anyone at all, not Murovtsy, not bandits. ... On one of the sites, I found a large photo material on the topic: bloopers in the "Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed" and everything is confirmed by personnel. Having carefully studied, you understand – the director filmed the hack..." (E. Logoev).

But "tar", of course, is much less than "honey": the film continues to be loved by the audience, and, unlike many other cases, they are in no hurry to discuss "incorrectly sewn buttons" and "orders attached to the wrong place"...

Midshipmen, Go Ahead! USSR, 1987. Directed by Svetlana Druzhinina. Screenwriters Svetlana Druzhinina, Yuri Nagibin, Nina Sorotokina (based on the novel by Nina Sorotokina "Three from the Navigation School"). Actors: Sergei Zhigunov, Dmitry Kharatyan, Vladimir Shevelkov, Tatyana Lyutaeva, Olga Mashnaya, Mikhail Boyarsky, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Alexander Abdulov, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Victor Pavlov, Valery Afanasyev, Vladimir Balon, Victor Bortsov, Alexander Pashutin, Nelly Paul Butkevich, Semyon Farada, Boris

Khimichev, Rimma Markova, Igor Yasulovich, Elena Tsyplakova, Lyudmila Nilskaya, Vladimir Steklov and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1988.**

Svetlana Druzhinina directed nine films and TV series, of which the most famous are the romantic costume series about the adventures of midshipmen.

Film critic Lydia Kuzmina noted that in the series "Midshipmen, Go Ahead!" "the adventure intrigue has organically blended into the Russian surroundings. Chases and fights looked good against the backdrop of picturesque Russian landscapes, wooden log cabins and stone chambers. The suits of the midshipmen were not inferior in elegance to the musketeer's cloaks. The picture was completed by gracefully "scattered" here and there signs of romantic love... At the same time, the film was not only a romantic adventure – it was a discovery of Russian history. The realities of the Russian 18th century appeared on the screen, albeit in a very free interpretation. ... The film appeared ... against the background of a reassessment of everything and everyone – including ethical standards. Cynicism, apocalyptic premonitions and everyday routine, a sense of hopelessness flooded the screen. Druzhinina's painting was an exception. She talked about people who are true to principles, devoted to their loved ones, friends, their homeland. Possessing an unusually solid character, an active life position, the director showed firmness, did not succumb to general despondency ... Her films are sensual, their heroes are driven by love" (Kuzmina, 2010: 163–164).

"Midshipmen, Go Ahead!" brought fantastic popularity to Sergei Zhigunov, Dmitry Kharatyan and Vladimir Shevelkov, however, in the subsequent sequels of this series, the trio so well chosen by the director fell apart, and from the "old line-up" in the center of the plot, only Dmitry Kharatyan was left...

One way or another, but the attempt to make the Russian "Three Musketeers" succeeded, and millions of viewers (especially spectators) still remember this series with pleasure:

"This is the only film that I want to watch over and over again. And it doesn't get boring! When people ask me what is my favorite film, I do not hesitate to answer: "Midshipmen, Go Ahead!" And what actors have gathered in this film! Just super!" (Marina).

"A very good film, lyrical, patriotic, with Russian humor, musical. ... As far as I know, all ages accept him very well. ... And if modern girls accept him well, then all is not lost yet" (Vladimir).

"I say right away, this is my favorite film and remains it to this day, nothing like that has ever been filmed. I still remember when it was shown for the first time, our TV was junk and, despite the fact that it was difficult to see, we could not tear ourselves away from the screen" (Svetlana).

Mikhailo Lomonosov. USSR, 1986. Directed by Alexander Proshkin. Screenwriters Oleg Osetinsky, Leonid Nekhoroshev. Actors: Alexander Mikhailov, Igor Volkov, Victor Stepanov, Anatoly Vasiliev, Lyudmila Polyakova, Sos Sargsyan, Natalia Sayko, Andrey Boltnev, Kirill Kozakov, Gennady Yukhtin, Alexey Zharkov, Oleg Menshikov, Yuri Yarovet, Alexander Sirin, Nikolai Prokopzhevich, Ilze Liepa, Victor Sergachev, Alexander Domogarov, Boris Plotnikov, Leonid Yarmolnik, Aristarkh Livanov, Marina Yakovleva and others. **TV premiere: November 11, 1986.**

In my opinion, the series "Mikhailo Lomonosov" and "Nikolai Vavilov" are some of the brightest works by director **Alexander Proshkin** ("Cold summer of 1953..." "Russian Revolt", "Doctor Zhivago", etc.).

The film "Mikhailo Lomonosov" is distinguished by a careful attitude to the history of the life of the great Russian scientist. Alexander Proshkin managed to assemble a magnificent ensemble of talented actors who psychologically convincingly played their characters. Not at all carried away by the melodramatic possibilities of plot twists, the director avoided flirting with the audience. There is a real drama on the screen, where ideological and scientific disputes are no less important than adherence to historical truth...

Viewers of the XXI century remember the TV series "Mikhailo Lomonosov" with gratitude:

"A great film about a great man played by great actors. ... This film will always be young and fresh, like cool water on a sultry afternoon! Because it sheds bright light into the hearts of all those who watch and see it ... "Mikhailo Lomonosov" is a film for smart and kind people. Awesome movie! I watched it many times ... Igor Volkov's play is mesmerizing. It is a pity that it is not often possible to see this actor. In my opinion, no one has played Lomonosov better than him" (Elena).

"These are the kind of films you need to make about geniuses! After all, works of art concerning the life of great people are not only cognitive, but also respect the memory of the person in question" (Tatiana).

"A. Proshkin's series about Lomonosov is really successful, despite the fact that its plot has undergone some ideological processing in the spirit of the times" (Clerkon).

Nameless Star. USSR, 1978. Directed by Mikhail Kozakov. Screenwriter Alexander Khmelik (based on the play of the same name by M. Sebastian). Actors: Anastasia Vertinskaya, Igor Kostolevsky, Mikhail Kozakov, Grigory Lampe, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Svetin and others. **TV premiere: February 17, 1979.**

Mikhail Kozakov (1934–2011) worked on television, where he shot 25 television films. The most popular of them were the "Nameless Star" and "Pokrovsky Gate"...

Screening the melodrama of the Romanian playwright M. Sebastian "Nameless Star", Mikhail Kozakov, with a nostalgic grin and mild irony about romantic youthful dreams, told a rather sad love story of a modest provincial teacher (Igor Kostolevsky) for a secular beauty lagging behind the train (Anastasia Vertinskaya).

With the help of the brilliant cameraman Georgy Rerberg, the director created on the screen a colorful, theatrical, conditional atmosphere of a small town, where the only entertainment of residents for many years is contemplation of a fast train rushing past at full speed, beckoning with the lights of an unfamiliar, mysterious life...

Already in the 21st century, the film critic Victor Filimonov considered it symptomatic that "this picture emerged at the turn of the 1970s and 1980s, when the stuffiness of the country's social atmosphere, hopelessly closed to the rest of the world, was already well felt" (Filimonov, 2010: 234).

Soon after the premiere of "Nameless Star", I had the opportunity to meet with Mikhail Kozakov and talk about how the film was shot. I remember that Mikhail Kozakov liked my question about how he built a visual image in this film, and the director talked for a long time about his work with the brilliant cameraman Georgy Rerberg (1937–1999), which ended in the rupture of their creative relationship. To my question about why it happened, Mikhail Kozakov answered briefly: "Georgy tried to give advice on how to shoot a scene, an episode. He did not agree with my creative decisions, therefore, in the end, he was dissatisfied with the visual range of the film and removed his name from the credits...". Well, well... Rerberg was a great master of cinematography. He had his own vision of the frame... Mikhail Kozakov had his own... Still, both of them are the pride of Russian culture...

We talked with Mikhail Kozakov and how his "Nameless Star" differed from the famous Romanian–French film adaptation of this play by M. Sebastian with Marina Vlady in the title role.

...It seemed to me personally that the version of the famous French director Henri Colpi (1921–2006) significantly inferior to the film adaptation directed by Mikhail Kozakov in all artistic components.

The modern audience is still happy to watch Mikhail Kozakov's "Nameless Star":

"The film radiates warmth, in the truest sense of the word. As a child, I remember, I often could not understand why my parents did not leave the TV when it was shown, but when I grew up, I understood... And frankly, I watch this film with such frequency that I already have to buy a new disc... Fantastic atmosphere of the events taking place. Mikhail Kozakov made not a film, but a masterpiece, and even put a lot of hidden meaning into it... And for me there is no better antidepressant than this film" (Vitaly).

"As a child, it seemed to me that Kozakov's character was a villain destroying Mona's happiness, and now he seemed to me to be a person who knows her better and acts by taking care

of her. He's just embarrassed to be romantic. Kozakov is a genius person. I really, really love this movie. He is wonderful, sincere, kind" (Natalia).

"Of course Grieg knows Mona. But for him, she is just a property in which he invests money. And people of such a warehouse as Grieg do not just give away what belongs to them. ... This is not a concern, but a defense of property rights. And Grieg's monologue is amazing! There is so much bitter truth in his cynicism. Maybe that's why most of us do not perceive Grieg as a villain. "But these fifteen minutes will pass!" – sounds like a sentence. How difficult it is to change the habit in your life. After all, for this you need to change yourself! And this is sometimes no easier than changing the path of the heavenly body. Every time I look at the starry sky, I remember this sad story. Or maybe, among the scattering of stars, I will see the one that Marin discovered? I know that she will be the most beautiful. Low bow to Kozakov for this masterpiece. The film is timeless and timeless. Film is art" (Tatiana).

"Awesome film, masterpiece! The best for Kazakov and the best role for Kostolevsky. The main idea of this film is that no stars deviate from their path. Marin is a dreamer, divorced from real life, in fact, a wise and perspicacious person. He lives in a fictional world, "hovers in the clouds", because the real world is alien to him, the inhabitants of the town with their petty interests are alien" (Miriam).

Nikolay Vavilov. USSR–West Germany, 1990. Directed by Alexander Proshkin. Screenwriters: Sergey Dyachenko, Yuri Arabov, Alexander Proshkin. Actors: Kostas Smoriginas, Andrei Martynov, Irina Kupchenko, Bogdan Stupka, Sergei Gazarov, Georgy Kavtaradze, Tamara Degtyareva, Sergei Plotnikov, Nikolai Lavrov, Ingeborga Dapkunaite, Nina Usatova, Elizaveta Nikishchikina and others. **TV premiere: January 7, 1991.**

This series by **Alexander Proshkin** ("Mikhailo Lomonosov", "Cold summer of the fifty-third..." "Russian Revolt", "Doctor Zhivago", etc.) tells about the tragic fate of the scientist and biologist Nikolai Vavilov, who became a victim of Stalin's repressions.

The plot of the film is centered on the irreconcilable conflict between two scientists – Nikolai Vavilov (1887–1943) and Trofim Lysenko (1898–1976), which, in fact, ultimately led to the death of the first of them...

The refined direction of Alexander Proshkin, the wonderful acting performance of Kostas Smoriginas, Bogdan Stupka, Andrei Martynov and Irina Kupchenko, who played the main roles in this film, attracted millions of viewers to television screens:

"A brilliant film... Great acting, absolutely unique Mortar in the role of Lysenko... And the music is magical. Vavilov's fate is a huge tragedy, he is the true Giordano Bruno of his time" (Lika).

"After almost twenty years, I reviewed this film. And now he made an even stronger impression. The atmosphere of the era of huge victories and at the same time of the theater of the absurd is perfectly conveyed! What is most striking in this monstrous, almost medieval story is the behavior of many Soviet scientists who sent the great Vavilov to his death. There is no forgetfulness or forgiveness for this! Brilliant directorial work of Alexander Proshkin!" (S. Rokotov).

"The most beautiful film. A wonderful director. Amazing cast. It was especially pleasant to see my very beloved actor Andrei Martynov, in the role of Sergei Vavilov. Thanks to the magic music for the film, without seeing the title, I started watching the film. The film and Vavilov's fate makes us think about the events and people in our country, about who we are now and where we are going. The film does not go out of my head" (Nadezhda).

"Just super! And the direction, the actors, and the music. ... The spirit of the Stalinist era, imbued with suspicion and tyranny all the then life, oppression of free-thinking, without which there is no full-fledged development of science and art, people who turned into cowardly opportunists and appreciated for this by the authorities (Lysenko is a typical representative, after the loss of his patron Stalin, "forgot" all their accusations against Vavilov), against the background of which such fighters for the truth as Nikolai Ivanovich stood out especially clearly. ... Such people are the true color of the nation, even, probably, of the human race. Their fates were tragic, but they became beacons of strength, fortitude of spirit and thought for all of us. Being a real scientist, geneticist and botanist (a dismissive word in our time, the true meaning of which is overwritten by

stupid slang) Vavilov is fighting for a better life for mankind, pushing through his ideas of crop production, ignored by pseudoscientists. And how boldly and accurately Vavilov remarked in a conversation with his son, who in his youth clearly noticed lies and injustice, who doubted how an honest person should behave – “You must live according to your conscience” (Uralets).

“I watched this film a long time ago on TV, now I watched it again with pleasure. Great work. Especially shocking is the work of Bogdan Stupka in the role of Lysenko. Films about scientists are generally difficult to shoot – try it, tell an uninitiated viewer about the essence of a scientist's work. In the 50s, we made many films about scientists, but when you watch them, the impression is that almost all of them were filmed according to the same script – all our scientists are fiery revolutionaries and speak not in ordinary human speech, but in slogans. In the 60s, completely different films appeared – “Nine Days of One Year”, “I'm Going into a Thunderstorm” – a scientist is already shown there – both as a scientist and as a person. And in the post-Soviet period only films like “My husband is a genius” about Landau appeared about scientists, where a sexually preoccupied moron appeared instead of a genius. Apparently, it is believed that the modern viewer can only be interested in this. Against this background, a perfectly shot film about Vavilov is especially valuable” (Sergas).

Noble Robber Vladimir Dubrovsky. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vyacheslav Nikiforov. Scenarists Evgeny Grigoriev, Oscar Nikich (based on the story by A.S. Pushkin). Actors: Mikhail Efremov, Marina Zudina, Vladimir Samoilov, Kirill Lavrov, Anatoly Romashin, Victor Pavlov, Vladimir Konkin, Andrey Smolyakov and others. **TV premiere on January 16, 1990.**

Vyacheslav Nikiforov directed 26 full-length films and TV series, among which there are such well-known robots as “Fathers and Sons” (1983), “At Nameless Height” (2004) and “The Executioner” (2014).

The television movie “Noble Robber Vladimir Dubrovsky” is one of the most famous works by Vyacheslav Nikiforov, which at one time chained millions of viewers to their home screens.

Film critic Valery Bondarenko recalls that “the premiere of V. Nikiforov's film caused a slight shock. The creators of the movie seem to have deliberately entered into a clinch with Pushkin's aesthetics. Pushkin's prose is characterized by severity and restraint ... And now the authors of the 1989 film, as if on purpose, demonstratively pedal the eerie realities of serfdom, introducing a series of cruel scenes “from themselves.” What for? They seem to be far from primitive social satire. But there is a clear concept in the picture. The filmmakers are clearly trying to rip off the sticky cotton shell from the story, by rudeness and cruelty... Public and social (and historical) are presented in Nikiforov's film in the form of a harsh, defiant grotesque. Dubrovsky is a hero, but this is here emphatically nondescript, everyday, “private”, with a weak-willed youthful rounded chin (M. Efremov). Troekurov is a despot-serf, and no more (excellent work by V. Samoilov, – how useful to him and the “wild” Mongolian cut of the eyes!)... What is usually the weakest in the picture – a couple of romantic heroes – is suddenly filled with juices of real life. And both are childishly helpless in front of that “other”, “adult”, ugly life. The film is very, not in Pushkin's way, sad, in its mood – hopeless. ... Of course, in the 1989 version we will not find the wise (and saving) Pushkin depth. But here anxiety for a person is accurately and subtly conveyed in a world where “darkness of low truths” rules, where these very “people of the earth” rule” (Bondarenko, 2009: 101–103).

The views of 21st century audience about this adaptation are often opposed:

“Pro”:

“The film is great! I fell in love with Mikhail Efremov during this film. He truly played a noble nobleman who involuntarily became a robber. I read that critics underestimated Efremov's game, and I spit on them! Since the true critic is the viewer, and I am more than sure that most people who saw the picture were crazy about his performance. Michael, I wish you to realize all your creative ideas! You are the best, the best!” (Oksana I.).

“Contra”:

"I remember how our girls screamed and turned away when Troyekurov beat the old man in the face with a whip... There is no trace of this or many other cruel scenes in Pushkin's story. ... I won't say anything about the rest of the film's shortcomings: I've had enough of this muck" (Sveta).

"I am not a fan of this movie. We strongly disliked Masha – M. Zudina and Dubrovsky performed by M. Efremov. Its external data are not taken into account at all. From him, the same romantic hero as from, for example, Leonov Prince Calaf. Still, you need to study more deeply the era, Pushkin's works, portraits of young military men of that era, at least according to the work of the romantic Kiprensky, before taking on the adaptation of Pushkin. For some reason, the old prince Vereisky was ennobled. What is noble about an old man who marries a young girl against her will?" (CNV).

Old New Year. USSR, 1980. Directed by Oleg Efremov, Naum Ardashnikov. Screenwriter Mikhail Roshchin (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Vyacheslav Nevinnny, Alexander Kalyagin, Ksenia Minina, Irina Miroshnichenko, Anastasia Nemolyaeva, Pyotr Shcherbakov, Georgy Burkov, Vladimir Troshin, Boris Shcherbakov, Evgenia Khanaeva, Natalya Nazarova, Evgeny Evstigneev and others. **Premiere on TV: January 1, 1981.**

Oleg Efremov (1927–2000) as a film director worked sporadically. He mainly made TV versions of his theatrical performances. And "Old New Year" is no exception.

Naum Ardashnikov (1931–2012) directed six full-length feature films, of which the most popular were "I Came and I Say" and "Old New Year".

In the year of the release of the film "Old New Year" on the TV screen, he was greeted by the audience very warmly.

And already in post-Soviet times, film critic Vladimir Gordeev wrote that "the perfectly played film "Old New Year" is a freak show that you can admire over and over again. A whole gallery of recognizable types. Continuous laughter and joy. However, the second episode looks a little protracted, burdensome, but this circumstance can be justified by the directors' bold attempt to convey to the viewer the hangover atmosphere of a post-holiday" (Gordeev, 2013).

Rustam Svetlanin draws the attention of readers that "the very title of the film carries a deep philosophical meaning. The new is not able to cast aside the old and completely say goodbye to it. Everything repeats, everything comes back. There is nothing new under the sun. At the same time, the old can burst into the present and transform it, creatively renew it" (Svetlanin, 2014).

Without going into the philosophical jungle, many of today's viewers recall the "Old New Year" with nostalgia:

"A very kind, light film that simply evokes nostalgia for that past tense with great actors and their inimitable acting" (Andrey).

"This film is a true masterpiece, it has achieved the highest degree of realism combined with artistic imagery. Such works never become outdated" (Vladimir).

"I love this movie! Ready to watch it over and over again! What a nostalgia it is for that of ours, albeit disorderly, but so tender for each other, for that swamp, in which it was so warm and cozy! It's funny and bitter to tears ... And every actor is a diamond" (V. Fedorovskaya).

However, this film also has active opponents:

"The film is far from being a masterpiece. It's just really annoying at times. I'll try to explain why. M. Roshchin wrote the play in 1967. By 1980, it was clearly outdated. The level of dialogue in both families corresponds to the post-war level. By the 1980s, even in working-class families, they didn't talk like that – thanks to television. No matter how criticized TV, but it was it in the 60s and 70s that brought culture to Soviet families. The second significant drawback is that the play is poorly adapted for cinema. To put it simply, the scriptwriters haven't finished it. ... Therefore, when watching a film, the feeling that you are in the theater, sitting in the front row, and the actors sometimes shout out their lines so that the gallery can hear, leaves. The play was conceived as a farce brought to the point of absurdity. Sorry, but there is a lot of absurdity in the film and no farce. The second series is completely disheartened by its wretchedness. They would have held a party meeting there and assumed increased obligations. Which, by the way, do they do a little later in the car. No, in times of "stagnation" we lived both more fun and smarter" (A. Alashlinsky).

"I think the film is bad and evil. The characters' characters are stereotyped, simplified to satirical, even caricatured. I didn't like the direction, some kind of theatrical (in the worst sense). The director has no love or sympathy for the characters (rather, contempt for them). The character of Adamich was supposed to introduce philosophical notes into the film, but it turned out to be feigned and fake. The shortcomings of the film are most likely due to the fact that it is still a theatrical play that has not gone beyond its time frame and is no longer interesting. Even in those 1980s, it looked like a ridicule of "philistinism" and its opposite – "intelligentsia", leaving outside the scope of the film the philosophical question – who to be and how to live" (Gus).

Open Book. USSR, 1977–1979. Directed by Victor Titov. Screenwriters Veniamin Kaverin, Vladimir Savin (based on the novel of the same name by Veniamin Kaverin). Actors: Natalya Dikareva, Iya Savvina, Georgy Taratorkin, Alexey Vasiliev, Mikhail Pogorzelsky, Elena Solovey, Oleg Yankovsky, Inna Kondratyeva, Nina Urgant, Vladimir Basov, Yuri Bogatyrev, Vsevolod Safonov, Leonid Nevedomsky, Elena Drapeko, Irina Mazurkov Roman Hromadsky, Georgy Teikh, Oleg Efremov and others. **TV premiere: January 8, 1980.**

Victor Titov (1939–2000) staged twenty full-length feature films and series (among them – "If and Petrov Rode in the Tram", "Hello, I'm Your Aunt!", "Open Book", "Adam Marries Eve", "Vacation at Own Account", "Life of Klim Samgin" and others).

In the film adaptation of the novel by Veniamin Kaverin "Open Book", as always with Victor Titov, the bright characters of the characters created by the ensemble of talented actors are attracted. It was very difficult to attract viewers to TV screens with a psychological drama about microbiologists, but Victor Titov was used to setting himself difficult tasks, and, in my opinion, as a rule, he achieved success.

The views of 21st century viewers about the "Open Book" are often ambiguous:

"A wonderful, soulful, exciting and serious film... It tells so easily and easily about the life and work of microbiologists who discovered penicillin. A very strong film! While watching, I cried, and laughed, and worried... So well put, I am shocked. ... Here it is frankly told how some pseudo-scientists – careerists hindered the work of real great scientists, but who did not listen to instructions from above; people working in the bodies call the plague "ore", so as not to create panic among the Soviet people and to hide the fact of an outbreak of the plague in our country, they send their husbands to the danger zone to fight this infection and are not even allowed to say goodbye to their wife. Probably the way it was in reality. The excellent performance of the actors involved in this film wins over" (Alfia).

"The film is, without exaggeration, a grandiose one – one that will be remembered for a lifetime and can even influence the fate of a person: the choice of a profession, important decisions. We were lucky that this novel was filmed by the masters of cinema: both the director and the actors were ready for the task. ... Everyone plays well and I like young Tanya performed by Natalia Dikareva, but with special trepidation I always look forward to the episodes where Iya Savvina appears. For me Vlasenkov is Savvina. She reveals the scale of the personality of her heroine. If at the beginning of the journey (after the lectures of Dr. Lebedev) Tanya is squeezed and immersed in herself, but confident in her work and her teacher, with the advent of Savvina we open the emotional world of a mature person who lives a real, big life. To show this, one must be a person of a comparable level. Savvina's personality is so out of place here: her explosive temperament and at the same time – vulnerability, touching tenderness, sometimes – helplessness. Stubbornness, purposefulness, but also a tendency to doubt, and the ability to forgive" (Owl).

"I love this film very much. The atmosphere, amazing camera work, excellent location shots, landscape shots are simply breathtaking. Separately, I would like to note the grandiose music of Nikolai Martynov. ... The earlier version with Chursina and Gurchenko is good in its own way, but it seems to me that it lacks the depth and spirit that distinguish this film" (Lika).

"The film is beautiful, some of the scenes were shot amazingly. Besides... filmed surprisingly aesthetically. And how much beautiful erotica there is in the first episodes. Only one thing is not clear to me – why Titov approved Savvina for the role of adult Tatyana. I understand that the actress is good... But this is not her role so much! It was as if they had pumped all femininity out of the

heroine at once... In my opinion, this broke the whole image of the heroine. And, of course, the film lost a lot because of this. However, the overall work is excellent" (Raquel).

"I have a hard time regarding the picture and the topic of casting. The film seems to me rather weak (dramatically weak, if you will), especially in comparison with the novel. Actually, the film benefits most of all due to the strongest literary basis, and it is against this background that its main shortcomings are manifested" (A. Filozov).

Operation "Trust". USSR, 1967. Directed by Sergei Kolosov. Screenwriter Alexander Yurovsky (based on the novel "Dead Swell" by Lev Nikulin). Actors: Igor Gorbachev, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Lyudmila Kasatkina, Donatas Banionis, Alexey Safonov, Bruno Oya, Boris Khimichev and others. **TV premiere: May 22, 1968.**

Sergei Kolosov (1921–2012) directed two dozen films, many of which were very popular with viewers, especially the television "We Call Fire on Ourselves" and "Operation "Trust".

The television film "Operation "Trust" told the story of the successful operation of the Cheka, during which anti-Soviet underground cells were destroyed in the early 1920s. The topic was acute at that time, under the strict ideological control of the "authorities".

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) wrote that in "Operation "Trust", "as in We Call Fire on Ourselves", was a thick historical layer, shown broadly and ingeniously, using documents and today's testimonies of true participants in long-standing events. And there was a layer, so to speak, of human history: the actors, relying on the proposed script material, figuratively restored the truth of relations within documentary milestones. Adventure situations were not tortured – life supplied them; the atmosphere of reality built up tension with much greater force than is available to the duty detective canons. One could easily "put the squeeze on" in the film the "under-squeeze", even more, to an unthinkable degree "twist" what so cleverly came together in reality itself. Only a different task was to trace human destinies in the displacement of historical layers, and in its light such efforts would have looked like hopeless adventure formalism" (Demin, 1981).

T. Zorina believed that in "Operation "Trust" "the appearance of Kasatkina was a complete surprise... The actress, for whom the first condition of creative contact with the heroine – love and understanding, had to play the role of terrorist Maria Zakharchenko, who secretly penetrated into Soviet Russia in the 1920s, in the role of a knowingly negative one. Kasatkina imagined a person with his passions, beliefs, and his entire biography and tried to understand him. In every scene, in every turn of the on-screen fate of Mary, the charge of drama was for the actress in the contrast of sincerity, selflessness, unselfishness – these subjective properties of the heroine – and the historically doomed cause, to which Maria Zakharchenko tragically gave all of herself without a trace. Unconditional devotion to the idea was reckless and blind, strength of mind degenerated into hysterical agitation, thirst for activity – into gloomy adventurism. Doubts flared up in the fanatical soul, doom pushed to desperate actions, despair – to inglorious death" (Zorina 1975). (Zorina, 1975).

Already in the XXI century Film critic Larisa Malyukova notes that in "Operation "Trust", "the ideological background was carefully hidden behind the spectacular facade of a spy film. ... Kasatkina creates on the screen a portrait of an ardent anti-Soviet woman, an intelligent woman, a strong and sworn enemy of the Soviet regime" (Malyukova, 2010; 238–239).

Film critic Irina Pavlova emphasizes that "the genre features of "Operation "Trust" define the canon of the Soviet television film on a "revolutionary–historical theme": from now on, it is almost always a spy detective or adventure film, in the center of which the hero, without fear or reproach, is smart, handsome and noble. So that the exploits of this superman do not look lightweight, smart and talented enemies must resist him. No more sadists and drunks – the caricature of the enemies of the revolution is over" (Pavlova, 2018).

Spectators of the XXI century in relation to the "Operation "Trust" are divided into supporters and opponents, which can be divided into two categories: those who like to "catch "the authors of films on historical inconsistencies and "blunders", and opponents of Bolshevism as such...

"Pro":

"Directing by S. Kolosov is almost always a quality mark. "Operation "Trust" is among the most interesting, masterfully made films" (K. Karasev).

"Yes, a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since the book appeared, then the film. Today we perceive the Chekists as not so unambiguously noble and intelligent, and the White Guards are not entirely black villains. But both the director's and acting skills in the film "Operation" Trust "are at a very high level and have not faded over time. These are not the current serials that are baked in a hurry, quickly, cheaply and angrily. ... Probably Maria Zakharchenko–Schultz (one from the best roles of Kasatkina) knew something about what methods the comrades from the OGPU could work with, therefore she preferred to shoot back to the end and put the last bullet into herself. No less interesting in the film are Yakushev (Igor Gorbachev) and Staunits–Oppperput (Donatas Banionis)" (B. Nezhdanov).

"This film fits well with its era, when the Soviet ideology has already experienced cave hatred for the entire world around it and acquired certain humanistic features. And the filmmakers were able to convey this approach on the screen in a coherent and surprisingly successful way. At the same time, the authors easily got away from sharp corners and even managed to endow the images of enemies with ideological and principled attitude. As for the skill of the performers, it was also superbly "honed" for the style of filming at that time. It would be ridiculous to demand historical truth from this film. This is an artistic truth. And she always acts irresistibly" (Yuri).

"Contra":

"Sorry, I can't watch any Soviet films about "valiant security officers", since I am categorically against any revolutions and any security officers" (Anton).

"There are a lot of historical inconsistencies and 'blunders' in the film, which greatly spoils the overall impression" (Mikhail).

Ordinary Miracle. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Mark Zakharov (based on the play by Evgeny Schwartz). Actors: Oleg Yankovsky, Irina Kupchenko, Evgeny Leonov, Evgeniya Simonova, Alexander Abdulov, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Yuri Solomin, Andrei Mironov, Vsevolod Larionov and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1979.**

Mark Zakharov (1933–2019) transferred to the television screen more than two dozen of his theatrical performances. And there were not so many films (shot mainly for television) in the full sense of the word, but almost all of them became events of cultural life ("12 chairs", "Ordinary Miracle", "The same Munchausen", "House, which was built by Swift", "Formula of Love", "Dragon").

For the first time shown on the first day of the new 1979, Mark Zakharov's TV story "Ordinary Miracle" immediately fell in love with millions of viewers. The reason for this was not only the talented play by Evgeny Schwartz, which was the basis for the script and the brilliant acting ensemble, but also the original direction, which successfully combined theatrical and cinematic narrative techniques.

Alexander Ryaposov, a researcher of cinematography of Mark Zakharov, writes that "the cinematic composition of Zakharov's "Ordinary Miracle" is built on the basis of three interrelated principles: firstly, the logic of the plot composed by the Wizard–Master before our eyes, ...; secondly, the laws of the musical structure of the action; thirdly, transitions based on attractions. The director of "Ordinary Miracle", together with the film's operator Nikolai Nemolyaev, create a complex picture of visual images flashing in the Magician's imagination in order to visually convey the spontaneity of the creative process taking place in front of the viewer. ... In the picture of the world, drawn by Zakharov in his television film, a modern person, including the director himself, could find support, in addition to love and companionship, also in creativity, which is understood quite broadly. After "Ordinary Miracle", the plot of the "game of God" turned into a meta plot of Mark Anatolyevich Zakharov himself. Variations of such a plot, at least, can be found in his subsequent paintings "That very Munchausen", "The House That Swift Built", "Formula of Love" and, of course, "Kill the Dragon" (Ryaposov, 2016: 31, 41).

Viewers of the XXI century, as a rule, treat the philosophical TV tale "Ordinary Miracle" very warmly, but part of the ideologized audience, on the contrary, is trying to transfer their

rejection of the post-Soviet political views of Mark Zakharov to his work as a whole, rejecting on this basis everything the Master has done in cinema and on stage...

"Pro":

"Ordinary Miracle" is a good, kind, heartfelt film for me. ... I like the direction of Zakharov: his abrupt transitions, not entirely logical and seemingly ridiculous actions of the actors... But in this I see what I love most in films and books – a kind of hidden, deep meaning, to understand which you can only revise the picture many times, and even then – again, only if the energy of the viewer and the director coincides" (Anastasia).

"The film is really unique, even in terms of the selection of actors. Whoever you take, all without exception are actors from God, outstanding personalities in their profession. You can't single out anyone, everyone played 100%. One look Abdulov, when he is about to put a bullet in his temple against the background of the target, what is it worth! But he, in fact, really made his debut in this film and on an equal footing with the recognized masters of cinema and theater. The ingenious work of Evgeny Schwartz, brilliantly processed by Grigory Gorin and brilliantly embodied by Mark Zakharov. Excellent work of cameraman, costume designer. Music by Gennady Gladkov for the film is a masterpiece! In my opinion, one of those films where there is nothing to complain about and nobody. ... This is exactly the rarest case when a re-adaptation of a work surpasses the original" (Tatiana).

"Contra":

"To be honest, I don't really like Zakharov's films at all, with their "matryoshka" and "double bottom a la magic suitcase". In this case, Mark Zakharov, with formal identity with Schwartz's play, closeness of monologues, etc., managed to completely distort its meaning. Schwartz's tale is primarily about love. Zakharov's film is another sad self-flagellation. This is noticeable in everything, both in the plot and in the characters. ... From the very first shots of Zakharov, the king looks like an outspoken weakling, and if according to the book he becomes a "king" in the third act, then according to the film he was already a "king" from the beginning. The characters from his retinue are all one hundred percent lackeys and slaves, with their every gesture and movement demonstrating their weakness and powerlessness to us. ... At Schwartz, the Bear appears from the very beginning of the play, and Zakharov's emphasis is on the princess, who symbolizes the whole bright part of life there (it is not for nothing that Yankovsky's hero says about her: "extraordinary" – although there is no special emphasis on this in the play!). Paradoxically, the most attractive hero of Zakharov's retinue turns out to be exactly the one who, according to Schwartz's plot, was the most disgusting – the minister-administrator! Is such a change accidental? Not. Not by chance. After all, Zakharov was not filming a bright fairy tale! He was filming another film that castigates Russian reality. That is why the line of the Bear, the main one in the book, turns out to be secondary here, and attention is paid to other characters; that is why these very characters are typical representatives of "Chekhov's novel": people who "squeeze a slave out of themselves drop by drop", and immediately "take him two drops into themselves". That is why it is not the "prince-administrator" who is, in essence, an "honest thief" that is bad, but those who surround the king! This is a typical Russian-intellectual Westernism. And is it by chance that the hero of Abdulov, saving the "princess" (read – all the good that remains in our life), all the time rides a horse in a cowboy hat? I repeat: the meaning of Schwartz's work is that love conquers everything. The meaning of Zakharov's film is "oh, what are we all disgusting, reptiles, unworthy and weak lackeys and freaks!" (Lex).

Pokrovsky Gate. USSR, 1982. Directed by Mikhail Kozakov. Screenwriter Leonid Zorin (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Oleg Menshikov, Leonid Bronevoy, Inna Ulyanova, Victor Bortsov, Anatoly Ravikovich, Elena Koreneva, Sofya Pilyavskaya, Valentina Voilkova, Tatyana Dogileva, Evgeny Morgunov, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Igor Dmitriev and others. **TV premiere: February 11, 1983.**

Mikhail Kozakov (1934–2011) worked on television, where he shot 25 television films. The most popular of them were the "Nameless Star" and "Pokrovsky Gate".

Mikhail Kozakov's comedy "Pokrovsky Gate" has long become a cult, the phrases from it, as they say, have gone to the people.

But "at the beginning, the film was greeted with fury by the then TV master Lapin, whose power was reinforced by his friendship with Brezhnev: "You and Zorin cannot say: 'Down with the red Kremlin!'" – and you make such pictures! This is disgusting! This is some kind of Zoshchenko!" (Rassadin, 2007).

But Mikhail Kozakov's comedy, which revives the thaw atmosphere, was nevertheless shown on television, and a week after the premiere, a very positive review by Alla Gerber was published in the newspaper "Soviet Culture" (Gerber, 1983).

Film critic Victor Filimonov notes that "innocence as the main feature of the public worldview was seen by director Mikhail Kozakov in the 1950s, in its people, probably referring to the "thaw" ideals and hopes of a certain stratum. But the film also reflects the "innocence" that people lived in the post-war decades, almost subconsciously counting on a fair reward from fate and the state for the hardships experienced during the war years" (Filimonov, 2010).

N. Shipulina believes that "the cultural concept "Man" is realized in the film through the types and characters of the characters: among them there are heroes and parasites, intellectuals and "labor reserves", German-speaking and French-speaking, lovers and loners, there are ironic professional stereotypes and etc. This list is open to completion with any relevant characterologies and typologies depending on our research objectives. I think that almost all genius works of literature and cinema are those in which such a complex encyclopedia of characters is built. The heroes of the film are also presented as unique, unrepeatable, non-typified personalities" (Shipulina, 2013: 28).

And Evgeny Kudryats asks the question: "Why did the audience fall in love with the image of a soft, bespectacled "botanist" who is absolutely not adapted to the everyday problems of life? His hero, despite all the eccentricity and absurdity, is lyrical and gentle in his own way, is the antipode of the practical and hard-working Savva Ignatyich, with whom the main character of the picture Margarita Pavlovna is simply bored, since he is only suitable as a strong rear to ensure life, but not at all fit for the soul. This explains the paradoxical fact that the ex-wife simply does not want to let go of Khobotov – she needs him, even if in a different capacity. Anatoly Ravikovich very vividly and vividly shows us how difficult it is to live in the world for a person "out of this world", for whom there is a different scale of values. When Hobotov truly falls in love with Lyudochka (brilliantly performed by Elena Koreneva), then he has a "second wind", and life again takes on meaning, but the insidious Margarita Pavlovna does not believe in the sincerity of the ex-spouse's feelings and does everything possible to destroy this union. The ending of the film is fantastic, optimistic: Khobotov manages to escape with his beloved, even into the future, but this is not so important anymore. The main thing is to elude forever the eye of the vigilant "guardian" who for some reason imagines herself "the ultimate truth." The role of Khobotov has become the actor's "calling card", and the film "Pokrovsky Gate", which has brought together a whole constellation of remarkable artists, is still one of his favorite TV films" (Kudryats, 2008).

And film critic Yuri Bogomolov recalls that "in the year when the picture was shown for the first time... it was perceived as a cute trinket in a retro style. All signs of vaudeville were obvious. ... True, the ideological bosses quickly suspected some sedition in her. The intelligentsia, they say, still cannot forget their hopes and hopes associated with the "thaw", and amuse themselves not to cry, recalling past feelings and reproducing them with suspicious enthusiasm. Well, let her have fun, so long as she doesn't cry. But the emotional reaction to the picture turned out to be painfully enthusiastic. For the ideological bosses, this cheerful nostalgia was unpleasant, and at that time the film was not exactly banned, but postponed until indefinite times, which, to the surprise of many, were not far off.

At the beginning of perestroika, the picture looked like an absolute and complete triumph of Kostik's ideas. Hobotov, together with Savransky, managed to break away from his Margarita. Meanwhile, the last words of Hobotova that, they say, have fun early, let's see what will happen in twenty or twenty-five years, turned out to be prophetic. Today, after these very twenty years, it is clear that the romantic translator from all languages Khobotov has a hard time. If, however, he did not succeed in the field of the detective genre. ... The most tenacious in the film was the "love square": the parting spouses of the Khobotovs and the always enthusiastic nurse and unwaveringly

reliable engraver on each side. ... The Soviet creative intelligentsia can no longer be without quarrels with the Party. No riots against her. This was felt by the artist Veliurov, who said, not without pathos: "Maybe this has its own truth ?! After all, there are people needing guidance...". But Kostik, who blurted out that man is the creator of his own destiny, said not in the case. Hobotov is not the creator of his own destiny. He just ran away from his Party, and did not chase it away. Vaudeville turned out to be prophetic. History repeated itself twice. Twenty years ago – like a farce. Now it's like a tragedy" (Bogomolov, 2007).

Of course, most of the 21st century viewers who adore "Pokrovsky Gate" do not immerse themselves in the elements of culture and art, enjoying the sparkling humor, vivid acting work and the very atmosphere of this masterpiece by Mikhail Kozakov:

"Brilliant picture! You already know every word by heart, but you still watch, without stopping, and live with the heroes of the film, despite the fact that the time seems to be wrong, but in people deeply somewhere there are still Kostiks, and Velurovs, and Margarrits ! And it's so fun and interesting to watch and find them in today's life! Mikhail Kazakov and all the actors are honored and respected for this film!" (Snowflake).

"If they ask me what is your favorite movie? Without hesitation, I answer: "Pokrovsky Gate" (Steve).

Purely English Murder. USSR, 1974. Directed by Samson Samsonov. Screenwriters Edgar Smirnov, Vadim Yusov (based on the novel by Cyril Hare "An English Murder"). Actors: Alexei Batalov, Leonid Obolensky, Georgy Taratorkin, Boris Ivanov, Fayme Yurno, Eugenia Pleshkita, Ivan Pereverzev, Irina Muravyova and others. **TV premiere: December 14, 1974. Film premiere: August 1976.**

Samson Samsonov (1921–2002) directed 20 full-length feature films, eight of which ("Optimistic Tragedy", "Behind a Shop Window of a Department Store", "Every Evening at Eleven", "Dance Floor" and others) were included in a thousand of the most popular Soviet films, but it was "The Optimistic Tragedy" that brought him his peak popularity. But let's not forget that the television detective "Purely English Murder" was very popular with viewers.

Literary critic and film critic Lev Anninsky (1934–2019) shortly after the premiere of "Purely English murder" wrote about him as follows: "I was sitting at the screen in a complete split: Warbeck, the younger, was lying on the carpet, poisoned by someone, and with my external reason I wondered which of those present had thrown poison into his glass; with all my soul, I felt the softness of this carpet, muffling steps, and the dull color of the family silver, and the creak of stairs, and the thousand-year-old strength of the English type of behavior, which, like it or not, has its own strength, although, of course, there is an abyss of weaknesses... I tasted the monotonous equanimity of the speeches, the boredom of the bridge and highly appreciated the remark of one heroine who, with purely Russian spontaneity, suddenly confessed in the midst of this peace and cold that she wanted to "get drunk". And I understood why the director Samson Samsonov wished, as he himself said, "to expose the vices and falsity" of the English aristocracy and to film C. Hare's novel... I think he correctly guessed the interest of our public,

But the review of journalist Anatoly Makarov was traditional in the Soviet way and lacked even a hint of irony: "S. Samsonov's film is marked by many efforts to recreate the canonical British environment on our screen. This affected most of all in the selection of actors. This is especially true for female performers; The Baltic beauty of Estonian and Latvian actresses, their solemn slow-motion plasticity and restrained grace naturally combine in our perception with the images of the fatal ladies from the novel, full of mysterious secrets and mysterious disappearances. ... Gradually, with an intriguing delay, as the tradition of this genre requires, the denouement is approaching. However, already in the midst of events, we suddenly begin to realize that it is not the criminal mystery itself that excites us most of all. "Something has rotted in the Danish kingdom" is more important. The comfort and peace of the ancient castle turned out to be a complete illusion. Within these noble walls, the same fierce struggle for power and wealth is taking place, as in the entire world surrounding this castle. And which of these respectable gentlemen, of these beautiful

ladies, of these incorruptible loyal servants turned out to be a villain, is important mainly for justice" (Makarov, 1976).

The opinions of XXI viewers about the film "Purely English Murder" often differ:

"I love this film very much. I don't know how the British treat him, but from my point of view, he shows a great "foreign life". And the actors are perfectly matched. A true aristocrat performed by Leonid Obolensky, an imperturbable and superbly well-trained servant (Ivan Pereverzev), the heroine of Irina Muravyova rushing into high society, the character of Alexei Batalov, who is detachedly observing all the vicissitudes, etc. I always look at the picture with pleasure" (Svetlana).

"With great pleasure I watched the film – a psychological drama and a detective at the same time – "Purely English Murder". I have watched it a certain number of times and every time, like the first. Samson Samsonov was a master of twisting the plot, making it sharp, intense, addictive, with an unexpected denouement. ... You will not find such meticulousness, thoughtfulness, accuracy of every detail in the current cinema, everywhere tyap and blooper reigns. The acting of the actors is beyond praise, all, without exception, there is not a single weak role, unnecessary, failed. Everything inside and out is very high quality" (Lucy).

"There are more successful detective stories... The film is very long. The first series, in general, is devoid of dynamism – the guests travel for a long time, talk, and nothing happens. Yes, and the atmosphere did not turn out to be ominous and gloomy, so that it really became scary that a murderer was wandering around the house ... And Irina Muravyova, in my opinion, is not very suitable for the role of the grip of a modern girl, she somehow simple-minded turned out, despite the defiant behavior" (Crete).

Rafferty. USSR, 1980. Directed by Semyon Aranovich. Screenwriter Semyon Nagorny (based on the novel of the same name by Lionel White). Actors: Oleg Borisov, Evgenia Simonova, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Larisa Malevannaya, Vladimir Zeldin and others. **TV premiere: November 19, 1980.**

Semyon Aranovich (1934–1996) directed ten full-length feature films and TV series, many of which ("Torpedo Bombers", "Rafferty", "Confrontation") enjoyed great success with the audience.

The psychological drama about the American trade union boss Rafferty involved in corruption, fitting well with the standards of the so-called "political cinema", very fashionable in the 1970s, attracted the attention of millions of viewers, thanks to the superb starring Oleg Borisov (1929–1994).

The opinions of 21st century viewers about Rafferty are generally positive:

"I am convinced that the success of the film lies in Oleg Borisov's amazing performance. He had few equals" (Irina K.).

"The game of O. Borisov is brilliant. Wonderful music" (Alla).

"Masterpiece! An example for the "judicial" American cinema, which is not even suitable for him!" (Vladimir).

"I don't think we all understood the essence of this piece at the time. They looked at it as something distant, unrelated to us. Now all these problems have become acute for us as well. I am simply amazed how the authors made this film – precisely, succinctly and correctly. By the way, the book did not make any impression on me – it is boring. Everything is immediately sharpened, which makes it look more dynamic. ... Of course, O. Borisov is the perfect fit for the role. After all, it is shown that in the beginning he really believes in goodness and justice, but ... having taken the "place at the top" people change, and O. Borisov played this remarkably. And the ending when he falls down the stairs! Just now there was a successful person (albeit doused with a stinking liquid) – and on you!" (G. Grudnikova).

"Both Borisov and Dzhigarkhanyan played their roles here superbly. When the main action is connected with the course of the trial, interspersed with memories, a special load is on the conversations between the characters, in which the essence of each is manifested. Words, intonations, looks, gestures – everything is in place here. And the devastation of Rafferty when he learns about the death of his daughter – and moves on. And Farichetti's determination to avenge

the betrayal of a man he trusted more than himself. In addition, I remember Kaidanovsky – the coldly aloof Ames... Psychological persuasiveness perfectly combined with the social acuteness of the book. ... Hit the top ten!" (S. Karikov).

"Yesterday again, probably for the fifth time, I watched this outstanding film, turned it on for a minute and could not tear myself away to the end. ... the acting is amazing, especially Borisov and Dzhigarkhanyan. However, others are also at their best. Five!" (Sergey).

Red and Black. USSR, 1976. Directed by Sergei Gerasimov. Screenwriters Sergei Gerasimov, Georgy Sklyansky (based on the novel of the same name by Stendhal). Actors: Nikolay Eremenko, Natalia Bondarchuk, Leonid Markov, Natalia Belokhvostikova, Gleb Strizhenov, Tatiana Parkina, Mikhail Zimin, Vladimir Scheglov, Mikhail Filippov, Mikhail Gluzsky, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Leonid Obolensky, Larisa Udovichenko, Igor Staryev and others. **Premier on TV: June 23, 1976.**

Sergei Gerasimov (1906–1985) directed 22 feature-length films, eleven of which were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films. But he also had a very popular television work – the adaptation of Stendhal's novel "Red and Black".

Literary critic Yakov Fried (1903–1986) wrote about Sergei Gerasimov's "Red and Black" in the "Cinema Art" magazine: "You are surprised to see how many details from the novel are in the five-hour film and how succinctly they are depicted. This laconicism seems to be dictated by the style of the novel "Red and Black". And much more in the film is also born of Stendhal's poetics. Its foundations are greater than before Stendhal, concreteness and accuracy of depicting emotional movements and all through action... The film, created by S. Gerasimov, tells mainly about the personal superiority of a very talented and very ambitious plebeian over the bourgeoisie and powerful nobility, about how he paid with his life both for his superiority and for his ambition. In this interpretation, the film is close to Julien Sorel, who also explains the tragedy of his destiny in the last word at the trial ... The bills in the political layer made Julien's see-through action more straightforward than in the novel, complicated the actor's task (with which he as a whole... perfectly coped) and made it difficult to clearly and fully perceive the film's ending. But still, in general, the life story of Julien Sorel in the interpretation of "Red and Black" by Gerasimov is developed intelligently and meaningfully. It is received with unrelenting attention and excitement of sincere empathy. It is narrated in the language of TV art in Stendhal's way precisely and deeply" (Fried, 1977: 32, 33, 43).

And I must say that the audience of the 1970s, as a rule, also treated this work of Sergei Gerasimov very warmly, although, of course, both then and now – in the 21st century – there were and still are spectators who are ready to prove hoarsely that Stendhal's novel deeper, more interesting and significant:

"A brilliant film, just a masterpiece! There is nothing more to say. The images of all the heroes of that era are so accurately conveyed!" (Eva)

"It was Stendhal who was transferred to the screen – his thoughts in their entirety of expression, his attitude to the world, his artistic techniques, his aesthetics and his energy. "Red and Black" by Gerasimov is, quite obviously, the result of the titanic (and, with a high degree of probability, unparalleled in the entire history of world cinema – at least with regard to such a voluminous novel) work of artists, consultants on the history of France and art history, philologists – researchers of the work of Stendhal and his contemporaries. The accuracy of the atmosphere is absolute. The costumes and interiors – for all the apparent modesty of the means – are impeccable. The acting ensemble and the work of the director with the actors are almost masterpieces. The old people are especially brilliant – Obolensky in the role of Bishop Besançon, in his purple cassock, as if descended from a portrait of Raphael, Gluzsky – Abbot Pirard – a cracker and a pedant, but endlessly touching in his honesty and affection for the young pupil, Gleb Strizhenov – the Marquis de la Mole – un vieux galant (old red movie), a nobleman who lived and suffered in his lifetime, passed through the horrors of the Revolution, and emigration, and the revanchism of the Restoration, empty and absurd, but impeccably aristocratic. Two beauties, lovers of the protagonist – Bondarchuk (Madame de Renal) and Belokhvostikova (Matilda de la Mole). The first is

passionate, hot, as if painted in oil; the second is watercolor, transparent, cold, living not with the heart, but with the head. And, of course, young Eremenko in the role of Julien Sorel is beyond praise. It contains passion, energy, talent, ambition, painful sensitivity, and feigned hypocrisy. ... "Red and Black" by Gerasimov is certainly

"In my opinion, the film is" so-so ", the production is also ... Gerasimov did not convey Stendhal. Gerasimov to the viewer, in any case, after reading the novel, the film is superficial and remarkable only for the cast" (Streltsova).

"This film, as they say, didn't work for me! ... At first I thought that as a teenager I didn't see something in it! ... I watched it not so long ago! No — ah! Reasonable, if not cold it is for me, this is a movie! Everything is so clean and smooth that ... it is already uninteresting! The impression and the aftertaste were different from the book. And here, there was a feeling that they were trying to "believe harmony with algebra". ... Neither N. Eremenko, nor N. Belokhvostikova convinced me, alas! Their partnership led me to the idea that everyone works, first of all, for himself! ... And so it happened that Gerasimov's "Red and Black" I have since associated with "Faded and Cold"!" (Anna S.).

Return of Budulai. USSR, 1985. Directed by Alexander Blank. Screenwriters: Alexander Blank, Natalia Kalinina, Alexander Maryamov, Anatoly Kalinin. Actors: Mikhail Volontir, Klara Luchko, Alexey Nikulnikov, Olga Zhulina, Ivan Lapikov, Ivan Ryzhov, Leonid Nevedomsky, Nina Ruslanova, Victor Gogolev, Matlyuba Alimova, Ariadna Shengelaya, etc. **Premiere on TV: March 25, 1986.**

Alexander Blank (1938–2000) directed eight feature-length films and TV series. Preferring to work on television, he was remembered by the mass audience for "Gypsy" and "The Return of Budulai".

Coming to the adaptation of the melodramatic novel by Anatoly Kalinin "Gypsy" (the sequel was called "Return of Budulai"), Alexander Blank understood well that he was competing with the "Gypsy" (1967) by Evgeny Matveev. And here the choice of an actor for the main role was very important, who could overshadow the charismatic Matveev's gypsy, which the audience liked so much. Blank's choice turned out to be a sniper: Mikhail Volontir (1934–2015) fell in love with the mass audience (especially, of course, women) from the very first frames of the series.

Today's representatives of the older generation are still delighted with this diology by Alexander Blank:

"A film loved since childhood! So bright, pure, sincere, although there is more than enough injustice and cruelty. But all the same, he leaves hope, faith in something good that must necessarily happen in life! The actors are simply wonderful, both the main and the secondary ones. And the music is unforgettable! And songs that disturb the soul!" (Barbara).

True, some viewers find here clear parallels with "Indian cinema with a Mexican addition": "The telepathy sessions of Claudia and Budulai make you smile. But when the hero had amnesia, laughter broke out. All the attributes of soap are present. And then there is such a frightful bandit to a heap, in the last episode the main character heroically catches him. Well, of course, this "Mexican" series was very popular with Soviet viewers" (Elefan).

Rich Man, Poor Man. USSR, 1982. Directed by Arūnas Žebriūnas. Screenwriter Saulius – Thomas Kondrotas (based on the novel by Irwin Shaw). Actors: Ruta Staliluyunaite, Lubomiras Laucevicus, Nele Savichenko–Klimene, Saulius Balandis, Remigius Sabulis, Igor Rogachev, Georgy Taratorkin, Regimantas Adomaitis and others. **TV premiere: 1984.**

Arūnas Žebriūnas (1930–2013) is one of the most famous Lithuanian screen masters. He is the author of 12 full-length feature films ("Girl and Echo", "The Little Prince", "Beauty", "Midnighter", "Nut Bread", "Journey to Paradise", etc.).

The adaptation of Irwin Shaw's novel "Rich Man, Poor Man" was filmed in the wake of the success of "American Tragedy", and, in my opinion, quite deservedly had a success with a television audience.

Viewers today, as a rule, remember this film with pleasure:

"I love this film and the works of I. Shaw very much. The topic of family relationships, the topic of money and power will never become outdated. And all the ambiguity of the main characters of the film is shown brilliantly. The performance of all the actors in this film is remarkable" (Y. Yakovleva).

"Surprisingly, the film is not outdated at all, despite the fact that it was created with a certain ideological orientation" (Vitaly).

"In my opinion, this is one of the rare films that touches on all the essential issues in life: what to live for, how to prioritize, is it possible to step over someone, etc. Even if we remove the ugly clichés that got into the picture due to time, even now the film looks not just relevant, but with some naked honesty and challenge ... The most important thing that I took from the film and the book: for everything in this life has to be paid... And in general, you have to live honestly" (I. Nikitin).

Say a Word about the Poor Hussar. USSR, 1980. Directed by Eldar Ryazanov. Screenwriters: Grigory Gorin, Eldar Ryazanov. Actors: Evgeny Leonov, Oleg Basilashvili, Irina Mazurkevich, Stanislav Sadalsky, Valentin Gaft, Georgy Burkov, Zinovy Gerdt, Victor Pavlov, Borislav Brondukov, Vladimir Nosik, Natalya Gundareva, Svetlana Nemolyaeva, Liya Akhedzhakova, Valentina Talyzin and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1981.**

Eldar Ryazanov (1927–2015) directed 26 full-length feature films, 15 of which ("Office Romance", "The Incredible Adventures of Italians in Russia", "The Hussar Ballad", "Carnival Night", "Girl Without an Address", "The Station for Two", "The Old Robbers", "Give a Book of Complaints", "Beware of the Car", "Garage", "Zigzag of Fortune", "Quite Seriously", "Cruel Romance", "Forgotten Melody for the Flute", "Dear Elena Sergeevna") were included in the 1000 highest grossing Soviet films (and this is not counting his TV hits – "Irony of Fate" and "Say a Word about the Poor Hussar").

The film "Say a Word about the Poor Hussar" was full of allusions and allegories, in which the playwright Grigory Gorin (1940–2000) was always strong. Due to censorship requirements, the position of the main negative character (his role was brilliantly played by Oleg Basilashvili) was changed. From a gendarme officer, he transformed into Privy Counselor...

Today's viewers perceive this picture ambiguously. Someone unconditionally likes it, and someone tries to find certain historical inaccuracies in it, while forgetting about the conventions of the genre of tragicomedy ...

"Pro":

"This is Ryazanov's smartest film. It is not only about Nikolayev's Russia and not about the Soviet era of the 1970s. It contains eternal values, opposing meanness, sycophancy, and sycophancy. At the end of the film, the commander says about himself: "He served honestly, took part in all wars and did not bow to bullets. He did not bend to his superiors either, so he did not become a general. However, he made a true military career. He died in the Crimean company for the Fatherland" (Sineman).

"One of the main problems of our society is truthfully shown, when the people and the officials, supposedly representing the interests of the state, are on opposite sides of the barricades, and the people are constantly on the defensive. That is, for the people, the Merzlyaevs are not servants or fathers, but enemies. Such an alignment, in my opinion, is dangerous for any society, including ours. Moreover, as we can see, the system plays absolutely no role here. It was under the tsarist regime, under the Soviet, and under the post-Soviet regime, and it is still relevant today" (Tarandot).

"It is hardly worth looking for historical accuracy in a work that the authors conceived as a tragicomedy in a conventional pseudo-historical setting with allusions to the present. In a sense,

there was also a fig in the pocket of the Soviet regime, demonstrated by the moderately dissident creative intelligentsia" (B. Nezhdanov).

"Contra":

Ryazanov's first mediocre film. A sample of cinema for the needs of the day. The film has not stood the test of time. Now, thirty years later, it looks more and more gray, inexpressive, banal. It irrevocably goes into the past along with its time, and everything is more muffled and indistinct in the present day. This film by Ryazanov is weak precisely because of its superficial literary basis. Ryazanov shot his best films in collaboration with Braginsky, according to his magnificent scripts. As it turned out, it was Braginsky's wonderful drama that was the secret of such good films as "Beware of the Car", "Zigzag of Luck", "Old Robbers", "Irony of Fate", "Office Romance", "Garage", "Station for Two". ... It is interesting that Ryazanov's films, shot without a good script, do not stand up to criticism from the point of view of staging. Good actors don't save you" (Pavel).

"What exactly did the filmmakers want? Did they want to strike at the late Soviet regime, denouncing the autocracy? Nothing original, and stupid. Moreover, you can denounce in different ways. Grigory Gorin, for example, knew how, in his best things, to pave the way from the funny to the serious. Here, one has nothing to do with the other. It's like serving some herring with a side dish of chocolate ice cream. But after all, Ryazanov also failed to deduce this connection between humor (sometimes very tough!) And difficult problems. In earlier works, he succeeded. Just remember the "Hussar Ballad" – how easy it was to make the transitions from the comic to the military heroics and back! But here something changed the master – either his instinct, or some of the author's techniques did not work" (C. Sens).

Seven Old Men and One Girl. USSR, 1968. Directed by Evgeny Karelov. Screenwriters Evgeny Karelov, Albert Ivanov. Actors: Svetlana Savelova, Valentin Smirnitsky, Boris Chirkov, Boris Novikov, Nikolai Parfyonov, Alexey Smirnov, Anatoly Adoskin, Alexander Beniaminov, Evgeny Vesnik, Georgy Vitsin, Yuri Nikulin, Evgeny Morgunov, Anatoly Papanov and others. **TV Premire: March 16, 1969.**

Evgeny Karelov (1931–1977) directed 9 full-length feature films, four of which ("The Third Half", "Children of Don Quixote", "Two Comrades Served", "I – Shapovalov T.P.") were included in the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films.

Unfortunately, the fate of the leading role in this film is Svetlana Savolova (1942–1999) – developed very dramatically. Shortly after the premiere of "Seven Old Men and One Girl", she had an accident that disfigured her face. They stopped filming her, and she slowly became addicted to alcohol...

As the film critic Irina Grashchenkova wrote, in the comedy "Seven Old Men and One Girl" "ironically played on the theme of old age as decrepitude of an indifferent soul, and not the physical state of a person. However, to reveal it, the scriptwriters... did not provide enough dramatic material. Neither live music... nor an ensemble of comic actors of the first magnitude could overcome this shortcoming" (Grashchenkova, 2010: 218).

Indeed, the authors of the film used in the plot of the film and rented from Leonid Gaidai "trio" (Georgy Vitsin, Yuri Nikulin, Yevgeny Morgunov), and Fantomas, and the charm of Svetlana Savolova...

However, this comedy still has a lot of fans who remember this work of Evgeny Karelov with a sense of nostalgia:

"One of the few truly stylish films of the socialist era. I don't know whose merit – the director, the artist, or all together, but look at the scenery, in what other films of that time you will see it. The girls who are just walking by, like a background, are simply wearing French raincoats. And the umbrellas! The main character in tights is something for the late 1960s. A very neat film, no superfluous, but modern! He always stood apart and now somehow stands out. ... Beautiful cinema, the eye rests on the screen" (Patr).

"This is probably the one hundred and first time I watch a film, and always with such delight. Indeed, you relax with your soul, no straining, ... everything is modern, modern even by today's standards. The film was shot for centuries" (Tatiana).

"I've always loved this movie too. ... The film stands out, among other things, with a well-thought-out color scheme. The authors would like to emphasize that this is a different time, it should be brighter than they imagined on the screen before" (Yuri).

"Amazing movie! So much he stands out from the general number of other, no less funny, Soviet comedies with his colors, decorations, and the light absurdity of what is happening. ... the action takes place in some kind of alternative Soviet Union, it's even difficult to say at what time" (Timothy).

But, of course, there are viewers who absolutely do not like this movie:

"Brilliant actors, such bright colors, but awful boring. At times Lena's methods reminded me of the Gestapo's. An evil smile, shouts..." (Betty).

"Recently this film was shown again, and I did not like it terribly: the plot is weak, the scenery is lurid and the wonderful actors do not pull out this "masterpiece" (S. Malyshev).

"I don't quite understand – how did Yuri Nikulin (as part of the famous trinity) agree to star in this film? After all, even in "Prisoner of the Caucasus" at first he did not want to act, fearing self-repetition. But there the trinity was "in business", and in "Seven Old Men..." it looks like a foreign body" (Igor).

Seventeen Moments of Spring. USSR, 1973. Directed by Tatiana Lioznova. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Vyacheslav Tikhonov, Oleg Tabakov, Leonid Bronevoy, Rostislav Plyatt, Evgeny Kuznetsov, Mikhail Zharkovsky, Konstantin Zheldin, Fritz Diez, Nikolai Prokopovich, Yuri Vizbor, Yuri Katin–Yartsev, Svetlana Svetlichnaya, Lev Durov, Alexey Dobronravov, Rudolf Pankov, Ekaterina Gradova, Nikolai Volkov, Eleonora Shashkova, Evgeny Lazarev, Leonid Kuravlyov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vasily Lanovoy, Vyacheslav Shalevich, Valentin Gaft, Alexey Eibozhenko, Alexey Safonov, Nikolai Gritsenko and others. **TV premiere: August 11, 1973.**

Director Tatiana Lioznova (1924–2011) directed 9 films, four of which (and this is not counting the legendary "Seventeen Moments of Spring") were among the most popular Soviet films.

"Seventeen Moments of Spring" is one of the most popular Soviet television films, which has become firmly established in folklore in the form of anecdotes and in the scientific community as material for dissertations and other studies.

At the same time, immediately after the premiere, he was warmly received not only by the public, but also by the press.

For example, film critic Nikolai Savitsky wrote in the "Cinema Art" magazine: "An adventure film? But "Seventeen Moments" is a rather "strange" adventure film. There, for example, they shoot only in three places, and they do it silently and quickly and – only when absolutely necessary. There are no spectacular fights, no chases at deadly speeds there. Love? There is. But love is discreet, modest, love is the secret of the soul. A cleverly twisted intrigue? Suppose we have seen even worse... So why didn't we turn off the TV for twelve nights in a row? Because there was a past that is always with us. Because it came to life before our eyes, and we believed it. Because at a distance to feel the living breath of history... And only let us remember again thankfully, how at first sight we were attracted by the familiar and elusive new (we had not seen him like that in the movies!) strong-willed, concentrated intense face of a man with intelligent eyes – in a thin net of sad wrinkles, how we were ready to look long into these eyes, understanding their language without any words, and to follow this man wherever he had to be according to the laws of a difficult and courageous profession, How we admired his courage, resourcefulness, firmness and his deep humanity – the strongest "secret weapon" with which the Soviet spy Maxim Isayev – Vyacheslav Tikhonov, the main character of the film "Seventeen Moments of Spring" – went into his eternal battle and became his main success" (Savitsky, 1974: 61, 63).

However, Nikolai Savitsky saw in this film of Tatyana Lioznova not only advantages, but also disadvantages, noting that "Isaev's enemies do not always look like really worthy opponents (for example, Schlenberg sometimes "plays along" too easily), not always a prudent intelligence officer behaves like this , as it should be for SS Standartenfuehrer Stirlitz..., the scale of his actions does

not always correspond even to those conditionally expanded possibilities with which we agreed" (Savitsky, 1974: 56).

Probably the most interesting article of the Soviet period about the film "Seventeen Moments of Spring" belongs to film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993): "How it could happen that you have both a detective and not a detective in front of you, and admiring the document, and its very inaccurate use, and besides, just trying to document pure fiction – we should find a special purpose behind all these oddities. ... No, this is not the genre of a documentary detective, pedantically shaking over every fact, Here the matter is much more sublime. Its true nature, of course, is a game, a flight of talented imagination, a resourceful interweaving of elements of reality into an original construction, both entertaining and instructive. ... The documentary layer, as we can see, is not a shield, not a disguise of risky notions, but, on the contrary, the initial condition of the narrative, in which the harsh realities of history are romantically transformed by means of adventure intrigue. ... The feeling of a "second reality", a fictional doubling of history, does not bother the creators of the picture. A game is a game, you can't hide it from a picky camera, so should you be afraid of an open dress that smacks of a universal medieval carnival? The masquerade came out with a tragic glow. The most formidable of those figures have been selected for him what recent history has invented. Never before has a scout, even the most ingenious, experienced hand-to-hand combat with the entire top of the Reich, either in literature or in cinema. ... And pay attention to how sparingly these "secrets of the Madrid court" responded in the pictorial solution of the picture. You are waiting for a mysterious twilight, the usual contrasts of light and shadow... This poetics flashes for a short while, in Stirlitz's forays under a masquerade mustache to a top-secret meeting with the "Partyigenosse" Bormann. As for the rest, we have before us an even, monochromatic light, a dryish picture of the frame, a detailed, unhurried camera. Artist B. Dulenkov and cameraman P. Kataev saw the "otherworldly", "infernal" territory as a long line of bare state corridors. Higher up, in the offices of the bosses, the atmosphere is a little warmer, with curtains, with a portrait on the wall. Down in the dungeon complete sterility. Not a rack, not hooks, not blood-stained walls, but the same smooth, all-filling light, syringes and lancets, prepared, alas, not for surgery. Here is one pole of the picture, the pole of its coldness. The opposite extreme awaits us in the final shots, when the sky, squeezed for the time being by ruins, roofs of houses, spiers of cathedrals, opens wide open, and Isaev, yesterday's Stirlitz, sits on the grass, absorbing bird voices, the ringing of silence, these very seventeen moments – peace, rest, mental relaxedness – all that is mortally dangerous where bureaucracy and hypocrisy are declared a lifestyle...

Conventionality? Still not a convention! But a convention that meets the intention. Not the superficial course of adventure events, but the true dramatic engine of the film. Swastikas, rituals of bonfires and torchbearers, skulls in the form of emblems – fascism was not averse to flirting with eerie black symbols, only the everyday essence of the "enraged shopkeeper" would hide from stubborn eyes. The film does not indulge these claims. The simplified presentation of the "background", as well as the manner of acting that sweeps aside ostentatious pathos and rhetoric – all this exposes "superhuman" inclinations, pulling out into the light of day what is hidden behind caps and uniforms, behind massive doors and triple guards.

What is there? There are people there. Crippled by the fascist order. Accustomed to trust the "system" more than themselves. But still people, not monsters and monsters. This is the second intriguing point and should not be underestimated either. ... Open pathology is not of interest to the director T. Lioznova, a pupil of the Gerasimov school, which combines lyricism (as usual, "soft") with simplicity (naturally, "soulful"). Everyday, familiar, was for the director of "Evdokia" and "Three poplars on Plyushchikha" only a form of manifestation of the initial conflicts of good and evil, sincerity and callousness, selfishness and altruism. That is why this plan, oddly enough at first glance, met the internal needs of T. Lioznova. Her familiar style did not mind the minimum of everyday details. The only thing that she categorically could not accept was the psychological minimum, typical of the adventure genre. The film crew announced during the period of work that they were filming a "psychological detective", but even this amendment, it seems to me, looks insufficient. The detective always internally gravitates towards conventional signs, hieroglyphs. Even the "psychological" one, he is only tolerant of the full-blooded lifelongness of feelings, forgives this luxury, but it does not exist. ...

One's sense of self within the behavior imposed upon him, the search for one's own, even if risky, destructive act. Without discovering this theme, we do not understand the enigmatic figure of the provocateur. L. Durov plays not an informer, not an informer, but an inspired artist of his work. This is also a way out for him – at least for a short while to show off in the guise of a rebel, embarrassing those around him with inflammatory speeches, an overly convincing justification for armed resistance. The price for this is blood, but not one's own, but someone else's! The immorality of the entire German way of life was perceived by this extraordinary man as an invitation to total immorality.

And Schellenberg? Already he, a person from the highest floors of the "system", should not feel its depersonalizing oppression. O. Tabakov appears in this image as unexpectedly young, artistic, constantly prone to irony – over colleagues, over himself, and even – it's scary to think! – over the authorities. But it is worth taking a closer look, at some point the dull constancy of his charming smile, trained enthusiasm, a well-polished mine of omniscience, behind which there is only confusion, submissive following events, even with the appearance of their full-fledged leader, inevitably opens.

This theme culminates in the figure of Müller, the most lively and multifaceted in the film. L. Bronevoy plays a man who has outgrown himself and secretly watches his own actions from a certain wise distance. He is a campaigner, a professional, but at the same time he knows the true value of what is happening. A cynic, a detective machine, he suddenly allows himself to be cordial and simple. Seemingly devoid of nerves, he radiates at times naive, sentimental sadness. Accurate, a hardened official soul, this person is not averse to making a joke, breaking a vanka, surprising the interlocutor with his breadth of sight, a paradoxical aphorism. Even with a full deck of trump cards against Stirlitz, Müller – in the filigree thin drawing of the performer – will not allow a single banal, long-awaited paint: neither rudeness, nor threat, nor arrogance of the winner. On the contrary,

What ominous overtones any, most natural shade gets here! We kind of swing on an invisible swing: "This terrible person is so cute! This dear man is so scary!" It contains a lot of buffoonery, unspent reserves of pretense, but as soon as you get used to this feeling, you suddenly discover unexpected seriousness while playing, a tragic understanding of the fragility and worthlessness of all this spiritual baggage in a world where the entire seemingly unshakable "system" is crumbling to its foundations...

We talked about two elements that made up the living fabric of the picture. As far as Müller is aroused by its playful beginning, Isaev also represents on behalf of the chronicle of the document, and is called upon to look like the most genuine product of history. The brave captain Kloss ("The Rate is Greater than Life"), who easily got out of any alteration, was more convenient to act at some time, in a certain country, against a conventional villain – a Nazi. V. Tikhonov's play is polemical in relation to this poetics. As Isaev's opponents are not puppets, so he himself least of all resembles a scout – a superman. Everyday, reducing details become the main paint of character. He is very tired, Maksim Maksimovich is already elderly, he is exhausted, which has not crawled out of Stirlitz's skin for a year. The mechanics of ciphers and appearances did not become second nature to him, it is given only with extreme, exhausting degree of attention. ... Ever since the time of P. Kadochnikov in "The Exploit of the Scout" and E. Kuzmina in the "Secret Mission", a tradition has arisen to focus on the moments of switching: this is how the scout appears before the enemies, but this is how he is alone with "ours." V. Tikhonov deprives this paint of its former significance. Isaev is warm, at ease in the radio operator's apartment, but a hasty glance at the clock accompanies the most sincere phrases... And it's a shame that the detective rules of the game cripple this serious layer of the role, and the same Isaev in other episodes looks more naive in the plot than the yellow-haired newcomer, then forgetting about fingerprints, then playing the aforementioned masquerade with false mustache... this is how the scout appears before the enemies, and this is how he is alone with "ours".

But, who knows, isn't this, on the other hand, the answer to the popularity of the movie? Is it not the point that it is both serious and relieved at once, that is, it is addressed to both a discerning and extremely undemanding viewer? Such coexistence of artistic systems, their smooth (and not very smooth) transitions into each other indirectly protect the film from the reproach that none of its levels has been drawn to the end, as a guiding principle. ...

All this, taken together, betrays some confusion of the filmmakers in front of the scale of their plan, the temporal extent of which alone is unmatched either in our cinema or in television. But is that the only thing? Or did the television epic involuntarily revive the unity, indivisibility of the ancient, primordially epic thinking, when the real events of history were explained by the intervention of mythical characters and amazing poetic insights went side by side with prejudices and superstitions? If so, then the lessons of "Seventeen Moments..." are all the more worth considering. That is why we tried to talk about them without announcing the "bells", without placing bold "marks" in the artists' table" (Demin, 1973: 4–5).

Eight years after the premiere of "Seventeen Moments of Spring", film expert and culturologist Neya Zorkaya (1924–2006), reflecting on the reasons for the success of this series, has drawn the following plot scheme, which is repeated more than once throughout the course of events of all twelve episodes: 1. Execution or continuation of the task of the center by Stirlitz. 2. Müller's countermeasures. 3. Peak of danger. 4. Finding a way out by Stirlitz (Zorkaya, 1981: 95).

Undoubtedly, this kind of rather simple but effective structural scheme made it possible to keep the audience in emotional tension night after night, as it resembled the movement of a kind of pendulum, repeatedly returning to a situation of danger and safely passing it.

Film critic Lydia Kuzmina draws readers' attention to the heroic–patriotic component of the series, since "as a result, Lioznova managed to spiritualize the traditionally lightweight adventure genre with the seriousness of lyric–epic cinema, relying not on the motivation of the detective, but on the ideals of the high duty of the defender of the Fatherland" (Kuzmina, 2010: 266).

Indeed, "The Stirlitz – Müller confrontation is presented as a confrontation not only between intelligence agencies, warring camps, but also diametrically opposed value systems. This – ethical – line is extremely clearly spelled out by Yu. Semenov; the protagonist is guided by it and measures his actions. Apart from these value systems, the characters of Stirlitz and Müller are shown both as high–level professionals who, towards each other, feel, if not sympathy, then at least respect, which gives additional drama to their conflict. From the point of view of formal methods of constructing an "arch" of conflict, the stronger the opponent–antagonist, the more respect the viewer has for the main character–protagonist" (Akopov, 2015: 9).

Of course, T. Lioznova's "Stirlitz is opposed to Bond, this opposition finds expression in many details. Stirlitz's inactivity has already been said, but Bond, on the contrary, is hyperactive. Bond is swift, an airplane, a car and all the necessary latest achievements in military and spy technology are always ready for him. Stirlitz is emphatically slow, the thoroughness with which he performs almost any action, the camera pays a lot of attention: here he opens the gate to enter the garage of the house, in these plans, especially in the third series, there are not even mounting glues, so that "accelerate "time, on the contrary, time is stretched, Stirlitz opens these gates longer than any average person would do. Moreover, this "slowness "completely conscious, thanks to her we understand that there is no place for randomness in his actions, no matter what he does, he constantly looks at his watch. The theme of time and the image of the clock are constantly present in the film: in the title, in the song, in the internal credits indicating the time and the corresponding sound of the chronometer, in words (or rather, "thoughts") Stirlitz about the impermissible luxury of giving the time roughly, not exactly. If we use the metaphor of a chess game, then Bond plays blitz masterfully, Stirlitz, having calculated the whole game ahead, plays the opening with special care and calmly waits for the endgame. Stirlitz is an obvious anti–Bond in what is the main pride of Bond, that is, in matters of relations with women. If Bond is constantly changing "girls", several in each film, then Stirlitz, despite the presence of women, no "mischief there are no links at all. Yes, he has a wife, whom he saw 5 minutes 10 years ago, in the film there is probably Gaby in love with him, who is his "not interests as a chess partner", there is Kat, with whom he behaves more like a caring father. But there are no women in the role in which we see them in the Bond films in T. Lioznova's film. Because of this, as it seems to us, a deliberate attempt by the director to create an image of the Soviet anti–Bond, the film sometimes uses techniques that contradict the main idea. So, for example, Stirlitz's internal monologues sound quite unexpectedly, sounded not already familiar "by the author ", but in the voice of V. Tikhonov, as, for example, in the third episode, when, after a radio broadcast, he is stopped to check his documents. Stirlitz, in the voice of Tikhonov, praises himself, calls himself a braggart and a good fellow, the voice of the hero instead of the voice of the author slightly reduces the distance between

the superintelligence and the viewer, which we wrote about above, since it is in this case that the viewer's self-identification with the hero is possible. And this is probably why this technique is unexpectedly used: we do not know what Bond is thinking, so we need to hear Stirlitz's thoughts, "said " it is them, and not a detached storyteller" (Muradov, Shergova, 2019: 50–51).

We can agree with the culturologist Marina Adamovich that "and throughout the twelve episodes of Lioznova's film, contrary to the external claim for psychology, the character of the Soviet intelligence officer remains static, given – at the level of the dossier read in the first episode. All episodes ... – not a deepening of the character, but an illustration to the stated characteristics. ... The same Eco combined his analysis with Levi–Strauss's idea of binary oppositions and showed how they control the main characters of a thriller epic and build a special structure of coordinates for a certain ideological model of modernity. In other words, all such serials are based on political–national–racial issues and contain gigantic ideological potential. Obviously, the very structure of the myth, based on binary oppositions, is ideal for ideological propaganda, in particular, for the formation of the image of the enemy" (Adamovich, 2002).

Further, Marina Adamovich points out very accurately that in the famous "Bondian" the "Bond girl" is not just a girl. ... The Oedipus complex of the super agent, given its mythological origin, manifests itself in the fear of castration, loss of masculinity – by analogy with the lost power of the once great Britain. So James is not a primitive "walker", but a hero who defends the idea of a nation and healthy chauvinism on the sexual battlefield. But the most striking thing is that the same Oedipus complex torments the communist Stirlitz. The only difference is that in the Soviet ideological state of the 1970s, no one was interested in what kind of man you are. Whether you are a castrat or impotent – it's not a shame, it was scary to be a fool, an intellectual impotent. As the spokesman for the national Soviet–Russian myth, Stirlitz pays tribute to the peculiarities of the country that gave birth to him. IN USSR, In a real state of ideological and political dictatorship, the activity of thought has completely replaced physical activity. This is the paradox of the ideological state. In the absence of external freedom, internal, intellectual freedom was quite possible, which compensated for the physical super-activity. Is it not natural that in the West and in Russia the defense of individual freedom and national dignity has found diametrically opposite forms of expression? Stirlitz's hyperactivity as an anti–Bond, his hypermobility and hypersexuality are of a purely intellectual character. The line of duality, "anti – pro" was drawn by Lioznova in the field of "big sex" and brought to the point of absurdity: if Bond changes women more often than gloves, then there are motives of eternal love and an eternal complex, – then the same motives for Stirlitz turn into his virginity and purity. ...

And it becomes finally clear why Semyonov's spy thriller was rejected by Lioznova: it was not spy passions that worried the director and her audience, but the creation of a national superhero that would meet all the complexity of the modern national myth. ... This is how "ice and fire" coincided: the social hyperactivity of the Western man in the street, focused on real life success, and the metaphorical superpassivity of the Soviet person living under a dictatorship and retaining his individuality and honor thanks to intellectual activity" (Adamovich, 2002).

Culturologist Mark Lipovetsky believes that "Today it is very boring to watch the series: all the time you want to squander the longest passages, puffs, semi–official newsreels ... However, among the absurdities of the series there are also fundamental ones. These are, first of all, anachronisms. The civilian costumes of the heroes do not in any way resemble the fashion of the 1940s with overhead shoulders and wide lapels – all of them (both men and women) are made according to the Western fashion of the 1960s: narrow lapels, sharp collars of shirts, no overhead shoulders, all fit, colored scarves "peacock's eye", hats with narrow brims, hairstyle "babette" from the servants of Stirlitz, "chemistry" from his wife and from Gaby. ... The artistic mediation embodied by Stirlitz between the Soviet and the "bourgeois", between war and peace, between service and everyday life, corresponded as precisely as possible to the cultural and social functions of the late Soviet intelligentsia, and most importantly, to its self-awareness. Moreover, it not only corresponded, but gave mediation a truly heroic – at the same time muted and freed from official pathos – scale. It would be more accurate to say that "Seventeen Moments of Spring" used the heroic semantics of the main Soviet myth – the myth of the Patriotic War – transforming it into an extremely charming myth about a mediator – an intellectual. With a more rigorous look, this myth can be defined as the myth of intellectual doublethink. Which, paradoxically, does not exclude

either heroism or charm. ... Tikhonov really embodied in Stirlitz an almost ideal image of an intelligent, restrained and self-ironic intellectual, at the same time freed from stereotypical intellectual weaknesses. Iron intellectual. Playing chess and the piano. Knowing a lot about old books and antique art. Delicate in relation to others and at the same time closed to prying eyes. Polite even during interrogation and overwhelming interlocutor with pseudo-rational sophisms. In a home jumper and tailcoat. ... At the same time, Stirlitz's accentuated "non-ness" in relation to the Soviet experience is expressed in that undisguised admiration with which the camera gets stuck on the interiors of bars and restaurants in which he sits, clean streets along which he walks, a house with a fireplace and a garage, in which his life passes. At the same time, we almost forget that this is happening at the end of the war, under bombs and so on. Here arises the devastation of form characteristic of myth, what Roland Barthes called "the decline of historicity." However, the game with history, carried out in "Seventeen Moments", turned out to be somewhat more complicated than the author of "Mythologies" could have assumed.

"Information for Reflection", which for many years to come set the tone and style of Russian pseudo-documentary discourse, were, of course, important not so much as satisfying the historical hunger, but also as an exquisite exercise in Aesopian language. A micro-plot about the luxury in which Goering lived, or about the sexual adventures of the main ideologist with the appearance of an ascetic, a description of the career growth of the party secretary Bormann and his invisible power, the role of Himmler in the creation of "re-education camps" could not but evoke associations with the unmentioned 1970s with Soviet history, and with even more unmentioned, but rapidly circulating legends and rumors about the life of the modern party nomenklatura. How, however, and the footage of ceremonial meetings on the occasion of the next birthday of the Fuhrer with folk choirs and symphony orchestras reminded too much of the late Soviet anniversary vigils to be accidental. But no less important was the general discourse of the film, where every now and then there were phrases like "reforged", "party apparatus", "dissenting", "listened to Western radio", "this is not a telephone conversation", "his grandmother is Jewish" (I'm not even talking about the fact that it was "Seventeen Moments of Spring" that was the first Soviet television movie where the word "Jew" was generally heard!). In this context, such a seemingly "German" phrase as "We are all under the hood of Müller" turned into our formula, to which defamiliarization only gave an ironic charm. ... Schellenberg, thanks to Oleg Tabakov, appears as a former idealist – the sixties (namely, this image was associated with an actor in the early 1970s), integrated into the system, becoming a master of hardware game, but retaining some semblance of intellectual freedom (not without reason he defiantly smokes Camel). ... Thus, the entire character system of the film unfolds as a conflict of dissident intellectuals and intellectuals who decided to play with the system according to its cruel rules for self-realization and not without benefit for themselves (in a wide range of variants: from Schellenberg to Klaus). Stirlitz in this case, too, acts as an ideal mediator, connecting an SS man (or "chekist") and a secret dissident, an intellectual. Both those and others accept him as their own, and those, and others, he deceives. It is also interesting that this internal disposition turned out to be so precise in relation to the culture of the 1970s, which allowed to some extent extrapolate the future of the Soviet system and even, I would venture to assert, predict the scenarios that the "systemic" intellectuals will play in the late 1980s – early 1990s. ... In other words, Stirlitz clearly demonstrated that it is possible to combine serving "ours" with the existence of "not ours" model; you can serve, but not belong, and not belong to either one or the other – neither communists (by way of life), nor Nazis (by occupation), formally belonging to both" (Lipovetskiy, 2007).

In principle, the point of view of Mark Lipovetsky is shared by Stephen Lovell, who asserts that "about much of what the film tells about the inner workings of the Nazi elite is more applicable to the Soviet elite of the Brezhnev era. On the screen, we see a well-organized party state ... Whatever the author's intentions, many viewers from the Soviet intelligentsia perceived it in this way. ... the intelligentsia could consider Stirlitz as "their own": a cultured and educated person who is doomed by external circumstances to live in conditions of doublethink. ... At the same time, the series managed to resolve two key paradoxes that have never been so harmoniously resolved in Soviet culture before. The first is the existing contradiction between Soviet patriotism (if not imperialism) and a huge interest in the external, especially Western, world with its freedom and prosperity, which by the early 1970s was one of the main features of Soviet society. ... The second

paradox is the dividing line between the public and private "I". Stirlitz is a person who flawlessly fulfills a social mission, to which he has devoted more than twenty years of his life, giving up many pleasures and benefits of life. On the other hand, the same circumstance forces him to hide his inner world – for it is literally a matter of life and death" (Lovell, 2013).

In a word, the television movie "Seventeen Moments of Spring" very quickly acquired a cult status, which was confirmed, among other things, by the fact that, with the consent of Tatyana Lioznova herself, it was colorized, and the premiere of the color version (which, by the way, caused a flurry of criticism from the defenders of the black-and-white original) took place on the Rossiya channel on May 4, 2009.

It would seem that everything has long been said about the series "Seventeen Moments of Spring", but restless viewers continue to argue about it today. For example, there are already several thousand comments on this film on the site kino-teatr.ru.

Of course, most of the responses are positive, often even enthusiastic:

"This is the best film of all times and peoples. Better no one will ever create anything" (A. Krasilnikov);

"Nobody filmed the best. And now, apparently, he won't take it off" (Sergei);

"This is the best series of all times and peoples! Whoever disagrees is my enemy for life!" (S. Valiev).

"If I was simply offered to choose one film that I could take with me to a desert island, I would not hesitate to take "Seventeen Moments of Spring" (Lika).

But there are also viewers who clearly did not like "Seventeen Moments of Spring":

"Seventeen Moments of Spring" is in a sense a parody film, and it is not without reason that it immediately overgrown with a mass of anecdotes – both the plot and individual characters. Another thing is that this picture was filmed with a serious and lean face" (Asadi);

"The scene with my wife has always seemed the stupidest to me. And how wild, not worth it, the risk (if Stirlitz really was under the hood), and how useless reinsurance (if he was not under the hood, then he could have met her differently), and how simple mockery of a person. It's like bringing a hungry person to a restaurant and letting him breathe in delicious smells, secretly watching others eat, and taking him away to the hungry. The unhappy couple couldn't even look at each other!" (Klausse).

Of course, "Seventeen Moments of Spring" became a welcome occasion for comments from viewers – "believable", who traditionally do not see the difference between documentary research based on facts and fictional work based on fiction:

"I am not a special fan of the film, but I just read with great interest the study of this film for inaccuracies and errors" (Batyra).

"Now, an interesting blooper. The roughest! ... The train by which Stirlitz was traveling consists of modern passenger cars! I understand that the cars are of German production, but they were produced after the war, and their size is not European – they were used and are used only by us" (Passer-by).

"In vain they made Stirlitz single, the officer was obliged to marry (according to the instructions of the Fuehrer, the officer must reproduce the elite offspring...), the single were very carefully rechecked and suspected of everything, and Isaev–Stirlitz was 45 years old, not twenty-five, he would have been exposed long ago... A meeting in a cafe with a Russian wife is absurd, like a mockery of a scout. The image of Stirlitz is too ideological" (Andros).

"I must admit that the plot of this film is extremely naive. Fingerprints on a suitcase, walkie-talkie, not only Kat, but also Stirlitz himself. You might think that Kat and Stirlitz did not go to intelligence school, but only that they left the younger group of kindergarten" (Cerberus).

The color version of "Seventeen Moments of Spring" also caused a storm of indignation in the audience:

"The colored Stirlitz is awful! Such a film was mutilated! I feel sorry for the film, the audience (myself included), and Tatiana Lioznova. The impression of the "new version" is like a hand-painted black and white photograph. An unpleasant experience. In general, I did not understand: why was it necessary?" (Lyudmila).

"Coloring is not like it would have been filmed in the 1970s, then why? The work was done hellish, but absolutely useless" (Elena).

So tell me later that old films are not of interest to modern audiences. Such as "Seventeen Moments of Spring" are always interesting...

Shadows Disappear at Noon. USSR, 1971. Vladimir Krasnopolsky, Valery Uskov. Screenwriters Arnold Vitol, Anatoly Ivanov (based on the novel of the same name by Anatoly Ivanov). Actors: Pyotr Velyaminov, Nina Ruslanova, Sergei Yakovlev, Alexandra Zavyalova, Boris Novikov, Valery Gataev, Eleonora Shashkova, Lev Polyakov, Galina Polskikh, Gennady Korolkov, Olga Naumenko and others. **Premiere on TV: February 14, 1972.**

Vladimir Krasnopolsky and Valery Uskov are known to viewers mainly on television series ("Shadows Disappear at Noon", "Eternal Call"), although they also have notable works in cinema (for example, the film "Not Justified").

There were few TV series in Soviet times, so almost every one of them became an event in public life. Millions of viewers, the very next morning after the premiere of the first episode, heatedly discussed its characters and argued, sometimes to the point of hoarseness...

The film adaptations of the novels by Anatoly Ivanov (1928–1999) "Shadows Disappear at Noon" and "Eternal Call" told the dramatic stories of Siberian families spanning several decades. Here there is a revolution, and a civil war, and collectivization, and again a war, this time – the Great Patriotic War...

Viewers today are ready to argue about the TV series "Shadows Disappear at Noon." For example, the site "Kino-teatr.ru" contains several thousand audience reviews. Most of them are enthusiastic, and only a few mention the ideological presentation of the material:

"Great movie! I've watched since childhood... The film is a masterpiece! This will never be removed again. The actors play as they live, you really forget that this is just a film" (Lyalechka).

"Despite the fact that, in general, the life of ordinary people, collective farmers is shown, the characters in the film are complex and contradictory. Frol Kurganov, of course, looks superb in this respect, multifaceted and contradictory" (Andros).

"What a film after all... It's a simple masterpiece. ... How accurately the actors were chosen, how they live the fate of their heroes! After all, it was necessary to work this way, it was necessary to create such a thing! Notice! Each actor fit exactly into his character. ... Thank you, thank you, thank you to everyone who created this masterpiece of cinema... It is gratifying to watch" (Dina).

"I don't know how many times I have watched this film, now it is shown on TV again, and I watch it again. And it doesn't get boring. And I worry about Marya, about Frol, about Zakhar, just like 40 years ago. The acting is the highest class of acting. Students of theatrical high school, as a visual aid, should be shown. To learn how to play roles correctly. Each actor is in his place. To list everyone, there is not enough space. And how the age roles are built! ... All actors live forty years on the screen. From young age to solid gray hair. And everything is accurate to the smallest detail" (Adriana).

Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson (The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson). USSR, 1979–1986. Directed by Igor Maslennikov. Screenwriters: Vladimir Valutsky, Julius Dunskey, Valery Frid, Igor Maslennikov Yuri Veksler (based on stories by Arthur Conan Doyle). Actors: Vasily Livanov, Vitaly Solomin, Rina Zelyonaya, Borislav Brondukov, Igor Dmitriev, Nikolai Karachentsov, Boris Klyuev, Maria Solomina, Nikolai Kryukov, Victor Evgrafov, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Evgeny Steblov, Nikita Mikhalkov, Alexander Adabashyan, Oleg Yankovsky, Irina Kupchenko, Irina Kupchenko Alla Demidova, Sergey Martinson, Victor Proskurin, Pavel Kadochnikov, Sergey Shakurov, Leonid Kuravlev, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Alexander Romantsov, Elena Safonova, Larisa Guzeeva, Svetlana Smirnova, Maris Liepa, Vladimir Tatosov and others.

Igor Maslennikov known primarily for the serial detective story about "Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson", although his "Winter Cherry" (later turned into a TV series) was also very popular with viewers at one time.

"Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson" is often called the best film adaptation of Arthur Conan Doyle's detective stories for a reason. In this TV movie, the main roles are skillfully played by Vasily Livanov and Vitaly Solomin. And Igor Maslennikov managed to create on the screen a unique world of "good old England", at the same time exquisitely stylized and texturedly convincing.

Film critic Elga Lyndina notes that "Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson" "Maslennikov filmed everything, as it were, a little bit seriously, offering the audience a joint entertaining game with clues. And the audience willingly joined in, as they are to this day. ... The director again flashed in the choice of actors. In each of the films about the detective, apart from a few permanent characters, excellent performers appeared" (Lyndina, 2010: 293).

Film critic Alexander Shpagin wrote that Igor Maslennikov "composed a delicious and cozy world with its toy stiffness, exuding the uncluttered charm of sweet patriarchy, but it will not be possible to explain the phenomenon of the series only by the director's stylizing skills and excellent acting work. Yes, the crimes that happen in this world are nothing more than a seasoning for its comfort, like garlic sauce for lamb, but the story about them, kept in the Dickens register, clearly pushes the scissors between the present and the past. And nostalgia for the past expressed the growing – and then guessed by Igor Maslennikov – social need for coziness and comfort, for stability and confidence in the future; our craving for "outdated" moral values and the hope that friendship, love and nobility are not empty words. We experienced an acute lack of the sense of self that Igor Maslennikov had endowed the great detective with. Apparently, all of the above is the true reasons for the fame that went to the creators of the series, at that time – beloved, now – cult. A scattering of anecdotes about Holmes and Watson is the surest sign of cult. And in Foggy Albion, his heroes were recognized as their own" (Shpagin, 2001).

For those readers who are interested in a detailed analysis of "Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson", I heartily recommend the article by film critic Alexander Sedov "Her Majesty the Screenshot" (Sedov, 2019).

"Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson" is still one of the favorite TV shows of the 21st century viewers:

"A brilliant film. No English Sherlock Holmes can compare with ours. Vasily Livanov is the best Sherlock Holmes. In the role of Watson, I also can't imagine anyone except Solomin" (Anastasia).

Small Tragedies. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Schweitzer (based on the works of A.S. Pushkin). Actors: Georgy Taratorkin, Sergei Yursky, Valery Zolotukhin, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Nikolay Kochegarov, Ivar Kalninsh, Leonid Kuravlev, Nikolai Burlyaev, Leonid Kayurov, Natalia Danilova, Lidia Fedoseeva–Shukshina, Filipp Vladimir Smoktunovsky, Larisa Belokhvostikova, Alexander Trofimov, Ivan Lapikov and others. **TV premiere: July 1, 1980.**

Mikhail Schweitzer (1920–2000) directed 16 films, five of which ("Dagger", "Someone else's relatives", "Warrant officer Panin", "Sunday", "The Golden Calf") were among the highest-grossing Soviet films, and the audience remembered, of course, for film adaptations of literary classics ("Sunday", "The Golden Calf", "Carousel", "Funny People", "Small Tragedies", "Dead Souls", "The Kreutzer Sonata").

Perfectly aware, any film adaptation of the works of A.S. Pushkin immediately becomes a pretext for heated discussions, Mikhail Schweitzer took up the most difficult task of transferring "Small Tragedies" to the screen. The acting ensemble he assembled was extremely powerful. And on the whole it can be firmly asserted that the TV movie "Small Tragedies" has become a true event of the year.

Viewers are still arguing about "Small Tragedies":

"The most controversial characters for me personally were and remain: Mozart–Zolotukhin, Donna Anna–Belokhvostikova and Don Guan–Vysotsky (or rather, the duet of the last two). This is where the "passions should boil" is in tragedy. And the point here is not in heightened tones, but in the ultimate concentration of existence, for the questions that are at the forefront of such a genre are life and death ... And the more the "degree" of Guan's acting existence rises, the more the fading

and inexpressiveness of Anna is visible. I sometimes had the feeling that the artists filmed their paired scenes separately, not seeing each other's eyes, not feeling the message ... The appearance of Zolotukhin in the role of Mozart, I considered a creative experiment. In my opinion, not very successful. It is not an artist who is weak, in this case – the material is not for his individuality, as it seems to me. Instead of the refined (as in the portraits), refined and super-receptive to everything that happens Genius, I saw a chubby guy, a sort of "shirt-guy" in less than five minutes. Moreover, in tandem with Smoktunovsky–Salieri. This is who really demonstrated his belonging to the world of Music (which is only the nervous play of the latter's fingers). ... Another thing is surprising: I have never been bothered by all of the above to watch and enjoy this film. Well, she grumbled, of course, a couple of times, but she didn't stop loving the picture itself. And the more time passes, the more interest I revise it" (Anna).

"The film is a masterpiece, I don't know if I've seen something better. With such knowledge of the matter, respect for Pushkin! Every last touch is just great, and what music! When I watched for the first time, when the film ended, I found myself standing at the screen with my hands clasped on my chest, and I don't remember when I got up and how long I stood. It seems to me that it would not be a shame to Alexander Pushkin to show. The only role for which I would not give a five-plus (like all artists in this masterpiece) is Vysotsky's Don Guan. Although it's hard to blame him. ... You need to have a supernatural gift to play such a role with such a small text. ... Vysotsky is good, but he also failed to make a whole image out of the phrase "on the conscience of the tired, a lot of evil can be burdensome." ... All in all the film is just bravo, I only watch it when I want to 'make a feast for myself today" (Tatiana K.).

"I started to like the film from the second episode... "Mozart and Salieri". There seems to be nothing to find fault with – beautifully filmed, well played, but neither this Mozart nor this Salieri aroused much interest and sympathy. Not mine. ... "The Covetous Knight". The Baron is wonderful, and infernal, and human – but there was a little lack of interaction between the characters, the drama as such. Overall, I liked it. Smoktunovsky is extremely skillful with the word" (Kappa).

Solar Wind. USSR, 1982. Directed by Rostislav Goryaev. Screenwriter Ignatius Dvoretzky (based on his own play "Sasha Belova"). Actors: Anna Kamenkova, Valery Sergeev, Nikolay Eremenko, Andrey Popov, Victor Smirnov, Nina Urgant, Alexey Mikhailov, Leonid Markov, Elena Ivochkina, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Vera Orlova, Lyubov Virolainen, Irina Malysheva, Lilia Gritsenko, Grigory Bulgakov, Mayya Mikhail Gluzsky, Valery Storozhik, Ruben Simonov, Svetlana Penkina and others.

Rostislav Goryaev (1934–2007) directed only six full-length feature films, two of which ("Nocturne" and "24–25" does not return ") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films. However, his series "Solar Wind" was also a success with viewers.

The psychological drama "Solar Wind" is addressed to the world of scientists working in the fields of physics, astrophysics and physiology. In my opinion, Anna Kamenkova and Nikolai Eremenko played some of their best roles here, since the dramatic material gave them considerable opportunities to penetrate the characters of their characters, far from being unambiguously "correct"...

Many viewers of the XXI century remember "Solar Wind" with gratitude:

"This is one of my favorite films. ... I think that this is also the best role of Anna Kamenkova, whom I have long and dearly love ... One can also speak long and enthusiastically about other acting works. As for "Solar Wind", this is exactly the case when it seems to be a purely chamber film, where the characters speak a lot and for a long time (in the now forgotten magnificent Russian language), where nothing seems to be epoch-making, where there is not even a single intimate scene (for 6 episodes!), nevertheless, keeps you in some indescribable state of intellectual and emotional tension. This film is about people. And it doesn't matter what they do, if they are people. Then everything is interesting: how they speak, how and what they live, you can sympathize with them, admire them, love them, sympathize with them and grieve with them. This is not only their life, but also mine, all this is clear and close to me, they are lively, educated, smart, decent,

conscientious people. The same as the majority of viewers who watched this and similar films" (N. Zarechnaya).

"This is such a deep and poignant film about the fate of a young woman entering adulthood, but in essence, it is a film about the entire last generation of Soviet people who, in their complacency, are unaware of the social catastrophes awaiting them at the end of the 20th century. ... When I watched this film in the early 1980s, it seemed to me that for the heroine, for me, for all of us, there will be one joy ahead" (Rul).

"The film shows very well the bureaucratization of science. The creation of a "ruling class" in science, which could make mistakes and simply make the wrong decisions, got away with it. Ordinary scientists, in order to prove their creative solvency, had to make titanic efforts to carry out the most routine actions – obtaining a room for storing materials, a base for experiments, etc. Recently I looked again – I thought, if all of them had a good organizer, and also a material base – the mountains would have moved. And we also had to squabble with each other for resources (material and creative)" (Sergey).

But there is, of course, an audience for which "Solar Wind" turned out to be alien:

"I don't perceive him at all. I could not watch it to the end. If you look apart from the professional qualities of the characters, then the youthful maximalism shown in "Solar Wind" takes on too pathological forms, which is why Kamenkova and Eremenko look like absolutely asexual creatures. Their heroes do not evoke any empathy, forcing them to recall the worst Soviet films of the production genre, and from that the disappointment from Kamenkova's work in this film is even greater. "Solar Wind" feels for parallels with "Olga Sergeevna", but even there Dzhigarkhanyan played the only living person for whom you have at least some sympathy and whom you believe, but here – that the main characters are, that they are not – all the same. Dead and plastic" (Andrey).

"I watched this movie "diagonally", because I didn't have enough patience for a thorough and complete viewing... Alas, I was convinced once again that it seems that in Soviet cinema they never learned how to make feature films about science, about people of science. Probably, this is a really difficult task – for the humanities to create a film about what they do not understand a damn thing, but they are trying to come up with this "mysterious world of science" to the extent of their ideas, which were formed to a fair degree by their predecessors, i.e. again – filmmakers. What, in my subjective opinion, are the main (and typical) mistakes of the creators of this and other similar films. There are very few of these errors. Firstly, it is a strained attempt to introduce "entertainment" into something where there is almost no entertainment at all. And, if films about science belong to the genre of "production cinema", then we have to agree that even working on a lathe or weaving machine in another production film is much more spectacular than the rather dull outwardly shots of a scientist immersed in deep thought. Secondly, the lack of sufficient understanding of the world of people of science, their psychology, etc. Science, of course, was created by smart people. But it is not easy to show the mind on the screen, but madness on the verge of madness is easy! Which, alas, was most often used by filmmakers. This is about the "scientific" side of such films. Not far from this, the human, lyrical, everyday component has also gone. For some reason, filmmakers believe that since scientists must be abstruse enough to be considered scientists, they must behave in the same way in relations with other people, society as a whole. The result is a complete sham with fake science and fake human relationships. Surely the fans of this film will disagree with me. But I, having worked all my adult life in various institutes, have never met real people there, even in a small degree similar to those "images of scientists" which, to my great regret, were stamped by Soviet cinematography. In real life, in real science, hysterical extravagant personalities "with anguish" and could not exist, tk. science is, first of all, great, long work and great purposeful patience, which requires people with a completely different, opposite make-up of character" (Curious).

The "Solar Wind" of great science. And the science – the one on the screen – turned out to be smallish, invented by some sort of rancid and sour tooth today. Rather, pseudo-scientific intercourse, pusher intrigues, mercantile passions, career intrigues, plus near-operatic, near-literary – near-cultural "blah blah blah". A sort of "Union of the Sword and Plowshare named after Madame E.S. Bour of the Late Scoop period". It is this status that reinforces Vera Orlova's participation in these hefty "clever badings – gatherings" (in Mark-Zakharov's version of "12

chairs", if you remember, she reproduced the unfading image of the faded lady of the heart Ippolit Matveyevich). True, here the provincial secular salon is run by Nina Urgant, no less funny and terrible in her petty bourgeois militarism, especially successful in the merciless file of her unfortunate husband – patient and real (in terms of domestic feat) Colonel Moev (Alexei Mikhailov). All this, in fact, satirical, element is stuck to the canvas for a reason. ... Further... Foreseeing that the protective umbrella will not save, I will lay out my opinion about Nadya Petrovskaya. In short, in search of vague ideals and somehow unsteady, not very convincingly presented goal, this strong girl fundamentally ruins the life of all (and for some reason less strong) men. Moreover, it breaks and destroys, without looking, cruelly and, without quotes – serially. ... In my opinion, personal powerful temperament and, I'm not afraid of this word, the great gift of Anna Kamenkova was provided – pointwise and piecemeal! – a controversial, but peculiar share of heroism, sacrifice and, fashionably speaking, sacredness to the image of the systematically absurd, eccentric, as Vladimir Dal would say, "Pounding wench". For the same reason, this character is the greatest success (and the biggest snag) of the most curious film work. I have no doubt: for a slightly less bright actress, the image of Petrovskaya would have come out, to put it mildly, less positive, which he is purely scriptural. ... "World culture" has successfully introduced one harmful "truth" into the inert masses: they say, a lot is allowed for talent and it will get away with something for which the "middle peasant" is blown up to the fullest. ... There is no thing more dangerous than the "icon of poverty" (V. Plotnikov).

State Border. USSR, 1980–1988. Directors: Boris Stepanov, Vyacheslav Nikiforov, Gennady Ivanov. Screenwriters: Alexey Nagorny, Geliy Ryabov, Oleg Smirnov, Peter Lutsik, Alexey Samoryadov. Actors: Igor Starygin, Marina Dyuzheva, Alexander Denisov, Mikhail Kozakov, Vladimir Novikov, Lyudmila Nilskeya, Anna Kamenkova, Inara Gulieva, Girts Yakovlevs, Irina Shevchuk, Lydia Velezheva, Fedor Sukhov, Aristarkh Livanov, Ernst Romanov, Viya Artmane Eduard Martsevich, Valentina Titova, Talgat Nigmatulin, Evgeny Leonov— Gladyshev, Semyon Morozov, Andrey Smolyakov, Archil Gomiashvili, Gennady Korolkov, Vera Sotnikova, Marina Levtova and others. **Premiere (first episode) on TV: May 28, 1980.**

Boris Stepanov (1927–1992) and Gennady Ivanov (1936–2014) shot nine feature-length films and serials each, of which the "State Border" was the most famous among the audience.

Vyacheslav Nikiforov directed 26 full-length films and TV series, among which there are such famous robots as "Fathers and Sons" (1983), "At Nameless Height" (2004) and the series "The Executioner" (2014).

The series "State Border" in an adventurous manner told thrilling stories about Soviet border guards. From time to time, the directors-directors and the main characters changed in it, but the main author's idea remained the same – the Motherland must be defended under any power...

The film brought together an impressive ensemble of actors, which also contributed significantly to the success with a mass audience.

The opinions of today's viewers about this film can be clearly divided into "pro" and "contra", depending on their political views.

"Pro":

"The film is amazing. Yes, maybe somewhere they went too far, somewhere the film is naive, but when you watch it, you feel pride in the country in which you lived. And it is right. No matter what barking mongrels barked there, it was a great country. Everything that we have now was built then, and all these achievements had to be protected. Many have forgotten that it was during the Soviet era that the entire population became literate, and an industry was built, the pitiful remnants of which are now in private hands. Yes, it was all paid for in blood and sweat. And now to find fault with their own grandfathers and great-grandfathers, who have won for their children and grandchildren the right to be literate people and live in warm houses with electric lighting, use free medicine, etc., is simply the height of arrogance and cynicism"(Olga).

"An excellent film about the hard work of Soviet border guards, security officers, about their courage, the loss of loved ones, about the sacrifices for the good of their country. They deserved this

film, they honestly did their duty. A lot of good acting work in the film, but most of all I liked how F. Dzerzhinsky. He is not shown there as a kind uncle and is not shown as a villain, but who he really was – iron Felix, who created such a system of defense of the country that no one could defeat” (Kamo).

"Contra":

“It's a frankly weak series. Even as a teenager, he could not overcome the last series. The most important miscalculation is the absence of a certain single plot center, a certain red thread that would run through the series” (F. Pignon).

“The film is crammed with ideological clichés, imbued with communist propaganda” (S. Perlov).

Straw Hat. USSR, 1974. Director and screenwriter Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the vaudeville of the same name by Eugene Labiche). Actors: Andrei Mironov, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Zinovy Gerdt, Efim Kopelyan, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Igor Kvasha, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Alisa Freundlikh, Mikhail Kozakov, Alexander Beniaminov, Vladimir Tatosov, Sergei Migitsko and others. **TV premiere: January 4, 1975.**

Leonid Kvinikhidze (1937–2018) became famous for his television films "Collapse of Engineer Garin", "Straw Hat", "Heavenly Swallows", "June 31", "Mary Poppins, Goodbye" and others.

In the year of the release of "Straw Hat" on the television screen, film critic Alexander Svobodin (1922–1999) was dissatisfied with it, claiming that it was "alas! – a clearly prolonged film demonstrating the director's lack of that "vaudeville devil", the need for which Stanislavsky's student, teacher and actress Olga Pyzhova wrote about in her book. "Absolute Faith in Everything" begins with the director's absolute faith in the vaudeville he is staging. It seems to us that Leonid Kvinikhidze did not believe in Labiche's vaudeville and began to "enlarge" it. This is how two episodes appeared instead of one, this is how profundity arose, where there is only a sweet smile” (Svobodin, 1975: 5).

But already in the 21st century, film critic Irina Pavlova was convinced that “Straw Hat” was the best film by Leonid Kvinikhidze: “All the stars converge in the right place, and then this fantastic trio appears – the director Kvinikhidze (who is also the scriptwriter), the poet Bulat Okudzhava and the composer Isaak Schwartz. An action full of play, irony, cheerful scoffing and truly French charm arises. A real Russian musical arises, in which there is not a grain of imitation of American models, in which a sustained sense of style is intertwined with jokes, sometimes understandable only to us, in which every acting work... sparkles with that genuine diamond brilliance, which cannot be tortured with any spherhusils, but which is capable of being born literally out of nothing, like an ordinary miracle. ... "Straw Hat" is undoubtedly a groundbreaking work in the genre. Apparently, it is so innovative that to this day no one except Kvinikhidze himself has mastered all the original artistic techniques of this film" (Pavlova, 2010: 222-223).

Viewers of the XXI century, as a rule, are very warm to the "Straw Hat":

“Wonderful vaudeville, good comedy! I watch it with great pleasure! Mironov, as always, on top, plays, as always, just great! I love this movie” (Elizabeth).

"Great film! Yes, they are somewhat stretched, and the minstrels, in my opinion, are out of place, but the acting is such that these annoying little things are not at all important. God, how there is not enough now such light, enchanting, costume musical films in historical scenery! ... Such a scattering of talented actors in this wonderful film! And what are the acting finds? Moreover, the film is actually a benefit performance of Andrei Mironov!" (Gamayun).

But, of course, there are also skeptical viewers:

“Almost all Soviet film adaptations of French vaudeville are only a beautiful, colorful picture, behind which there is absolute emptiness, lightness and nonsense (a softened old form of the word “stupidity”)” (Freemason).

Strogovs. USSR, 1976. Directed by Vladimir Vengerov. Screenwriters: Vladimir Vengerov, Georgy Markov, Eduard Shim (based on the novel by Georgy Markov). Actors: Boris Borisov, Lyudmila Zaitseva, German Novikov, Sergei Medvedsky, Lyudmila Arinina, Valery Barinov, Maya Bulgakova, Victor Pavlov, Rita Gladunko, Leonid Nevedomsky, Alexander Khochinsky, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Boris Chirkov, Igor Dmitriev and others. **Premiere on TV: February 10, 1976.**

Vladimir Vengerov (1920–1997) became famous for the films "Dagger" (1954), "Baltic Sky" (1961) and "Workers' Village" (1965). The "Strogovs" series is also one of his most popular films.

Official film critics unequivocally supported the "Strogovs", drawing the attention of readers that this TV movie... was first shown on the eve of the 25th Party Congress. And this is understandable: the novel basically contains the "Link of Times", which clearly and succinctly allows you to reveal the traditions of the revolution in the affairs that have become everyday in the 1970s. ... Vladimir Vengerov managed to create the image of the revolutionary masses... And the image of the party will then appear in the fabric of the narrative, as a living and artistic image, the theme of the party will be interpreted as a force historically necessary for the people, which has arisen in its depths" (Kisunko, 1976: 62, 65).

Today, the "Strogovs" have much fewer fans than other Soviet TV series of a similar nature ("Shadows Disappear at Noon", "Eternal Call"), but there are still a lot of them, especially among viewers of the older generation:

"I am reviewing the "Strogovs" film again. I like it very much, you can study history from the film (not fictional, but real...). It looks, of course, a bit heavy when compared with "Eternal Call" and "Shadows Disappear at Noon" (my beloved), but still interesting. Of course, not everything is clear the first time, but by reviewing, you already enter the essence completely... You need to watch the film, this is our story!" (Ira).

"Great movie. Just a balm for the soul, cinema is timeless. Now they don't shoot like that, but it's a pity. Great actors, acting, directing, entourage... The main topic raised, I believe in the current unprincipled time, is close to many. And some kind of light feeling in the depths of my soul, something like hope" (Steele).

Taimyr is Calling You. USSR, 1970. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Screenwriters Alexander Galich, Konstantin Isaev (based on the play of the same name by Konstantin Isaev and Alexander Galich). Actors: Yuri Kuzmenkov, Evgeny Steblov, Evgeny Vesnik, Pavel Pavlenko, Elena Koreneva, Svetlana Starikova, Inna Makarova, Valentina Talyzina, Ekaterina Vasilyeva and others. **TV premiere: January 3, 1971.**

Alexey Korenev (1927–1995) during his creative career, he has directed 13 films. These are mainly comedies, among which there are, in my opinion, very successful ones ("Literature Lesson", "Big Break", "For Family Circumstances").

The retro comedy "Taimyr is Calling You", which takes place in a 1947 hotel in Moscow, was initially accompanied by audience success, but after the emigration of playwright and bard Alexander Galich (1918–1977) it was put on the shelf for some time...

By the way, another comedy by Alexei Korenev – "Literature Lesson" was also sent there. True, the reason there was different – the authorities did not like the "day without lies", which the main character decided to arrange for himself in a touching performance by Yevgeny Steblov.

Real success came to Alexei Korenev on April 29, 1973, when her comedy "Big Break" was shown on Soviet central television.

Five years later, on April 29, 1978, another popular comedy by A. Korenev – "For Family Circumstances", appeared on the TV screen, where the brilliant acting trio of Galina Polskikh, Evgeny Steblov and Marina Dyuzheva was successfully supplemented with enchanting episodes with the participation of Vladimir Basov, Rolan Bykov, Anatoly Papanov and other screen masters.

Unfortunately, after the collapse of the USSR, the fate of Alexei Korenev was sad: there was no work. And as the film critic Irina Grashchenkova writes, from lack of money "he started selling

newspapers near the metro and died" (Grashchenkova, 2010: 246). It happened on February 26, 1995...

The modern audience recalls the comedy "Taimyr is Calling You", as a rule, with a kind word:

"A wonderful, kind film! A classic comedic mess. What a wonderful song by Galich. So much light humor! The acting of all the actors is wonderful" (J. Yakovleva).

"I love this movie. Always cheers up. I really like young Koreneva, Steblov and Kuzmenkov here. In general, all the actors play brilliantly" (Nastya).

"What a kind, light and naively funny film, such films are no longer filmed (or cannot). It seems that the plot is uncomplicated, and the action takes place practically in the same room, but in fact somehow attracts – entices so much that you can't come off until the end of the viewing. A wonderful film, I always watch it like the first time" (R. Ibragimova).

"This film is one of my favorites for me. A hilarious comedy of mistakes. He's both funny and a little sad. And, most importantly, this is a very kind film. And the humor in it is kind. And the kind people in it are shown who are ready to help each other, but they met only here at the hotel" (N. Volkova).

Take Care of Women. USSR, 1981. Directed by Alexander Polynnikov, Victor Makarov. Screenwriters Anatoly Kozak, Victor Makarov. Actors: Andrey Gradov, Marina Shimanskaya, Svetlana Penkina, Elena Tonunts, Galina Venevitinova, Igor Sklyar, Yuri Zakharenkov, Algis Arlauskas, Givi Tokhadze, Yuri Kuzmenko, Yuri Medvedev and others. **TV premiere: October 1981.**

Alexander Polynnikov directed 23 films and TV series, but the audience will remember him mainly from his debut directorial film "Take Care of Women".

Victor Makarov (1937–2020) has shot only five full-length feature films, and the musical comedy "Take Care of Women" has remained his most famous work.

The unpretentious musical comedy "Take Care of Women" was remembered by the audience mainly due to the hits of Yuri Antonov at the time. The very story of the women's team of the Odessa tugboat, "taming" a journalist–trainee, was told, in my opinion, without much fiction, although the young artists of pleasant appearance, I think, tried very hard...

However, the generation of the 1970s – 1980s today often looks at this movie through the haze of nostalgia for a departed youth, and every year it becomes more pleasant to immerse yourself in its atmosphere:

"A beautiful sunny film. Andrey Gradov, singing in the voice of Yuri Antonov, is very funny. And I also really like the scenes where Zhenya's pasta stuck together, and he designed them like a cake, and the scene when Aivazov looks at a white liner of his own name, and then it turns out that the liner is called Aivazovsky" (Andrey).

"I reviewed it and, like many others, felt nostalgia! ... How popular these songs of Antonov were at the time of the film's release! ... It was interesting to compare the impression of watching in the 1980s and now! ... A very kind and bright film! ... It is difficult even to imagine the appearance of such a movie now ... After reviewing "Take Care of Women" many years later, I became firmly convinced that the four young heroes are shown more interesting than the four girls – sailors! ... The guys turned out to be more charming, touching and vulnerable in comparison with the girls" (Anna).

However, there are, of course, viewers who did not like the film "Take Care of Women", as they say:

"I don't like this movie. It's empty. Looks completely uninteresting. And Antonov's songs do not save him. ... Not a movie, but a complete failure of the authors" (Nord).

TASS is Authorized to Declare... USSR, 1984. Directed by Vladimir Fokin. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own story). Actors: Vyacheslav Tikhonov, Yuri Solomin, Nikolai Zasukhin, Vakhtang Kikabidze, Alexey Petrenko, Elvira Zubkova, Leonid Kuravlev, Boris Klyuev, Nikolai Skorobogatov, Georgy Yumatov, Ivar Kalninsh, Mikhail Gluzsky,

Irina Alfeyorova, Georgy Davychyev Leonid Yarmolnik, Mikhail Zhigalov, Eduard Martsevich, Lembit Ulfsak, Valentina Titova, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky and others. **TV premiere: July 30, 1984.**

Vladimir Fokin directed ten films, among which were such famous works as "Alexander Little" (1981) and "TASS is Authorized to Declare..." (1984), however, his most popular work with viewers was and remains "Detective" (1980).

In this political detective story, the authors clearly used the image of Vyacheslav Tikhonov, although many other famous actors were employed in the series. *In general, "TASS is Authorized to Declare..." was sustained in a strict ideological vein of the film confrontation of a new round of the Cold War, which, however, does not prevent many modern viewers from reviewing this movie again and again:*

"The film is undoubtedly very correct and committed, but it was made professionally, and therefore it looks with great interest. It's nice to watch an ideological battle with such smart and beautiful opponents... Very sweet Alferova, wonderful episodes of Konstantinov's conversations with her friends. In general, it is surprising as for the film genre, but all the actors who appear in the frame in separate stories—episodes look very organic" (Lika).

"I love spy movies! This film was an event in its day! Everyone watched and discussed! And now I am reviewing with pleasure (do not believe me – I finished reviewing yesterday!) And again everything has captured – there is something to think about! ... So the film is for those who like to work with their brains, to reflect, and not "bang-bang" (Lysistrata).

"The film is wonderful (as well as the novel by Yulian Semyonov). I first saw this film when I was still a schoolgirl. I liked very much for its uniqueness, dissimilarity to other "spy" films, because almost the entire film is built on the dialogues of the characters, and as such there are not very many active actions in it. And what wonderful actors they play, real stars! Nowadays, of course, you watch this film with different eyes. But in contrast to modern "catch-up shooters", this, in its own way, unique TV movie wants to be watched several times, at least in order to once again enjoy the play of our favorite actors" (Malika).

"I first saw the film as a teenager in 1984. First impressions were rather negative, the film seemed boring, overly politicized and tendentious. Good "our" and bad Americans, this thought ran like a red thread through all ten episodes. However, with each new viewing, the experience improved. Now I perceive the series as a cast of the era when there were two superpowers in the world – the USSR and the USA. With all the disadvantages of "developed socialism", this is pleasant ... A powerful impression remains from the work of the state security. Foreign business trips, any number of technical means, cover documents, etc." (Alexei).

Teenager. USSR, 1983. Director and screenwriter Evgeny Tashkov (based on the novel of the same name by F. Dostoevsky). Actors: Andrey Tashkov, Oleg Borisov, Larisa Malevannaya, Evgeny Gerasimov, Marina Fedina, Leonid Obolensky, Tatyana Tashkova, Natalia Gundareva, Oleg Golubitsky, Larisa Udovichenko, Evgenia Simonova, Boris Galkin, Boris Novikov and others. **TV premiere: November 15, 1983.**

Evgeny Tashkov (1926–2012) directed 11 films, three of which ("Thirst", "Come Tomorrow" and "Crime") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films. And this is not counting his main hits – the television series "Major "Whirlwind" and "Adjutant of His Excellency". A notable phenomenon on the TV screen was Evgeny Tashkov's adaptation of F.M. Dostoevsky's "Teenager".

Thorough, psychologically well–designed film adaptation of "Teenager" still attracts viewers. I would like to pay special attention to the main roles, brilliantly played by Andrey Tashkov and Oleg Borisov.

The modern audience perceives the film adaptation of "Teenager", as a rule, positively:

"For some reason I love the novel "Teenager" more than other works of Dostoevsky. Perhaps because he does not seem as gloomy and hopeless as many of his other books. I saw the film before I read the book, and I think that this is one of the most complete and adequate film adaptations.

Magnificent actors, precisely recreated atmosphere, no "soap opera"... The duet of Oleg Borisov and Andrey Tashkov, the complicated relationship between the father and the illegitimate son is wonderful. Almost all characters are remembered in the film, even episodic ones. It is unlikely that today it is possible to film anew better than Evgeny Tashkov did" (Boris).

"Great movie! I love him since school! A real teenager with all the sorrows and joys, the first encounter with life. The film is not boring and very interesting" (Viksy).

"I think I will watch a great movie many more times. Delight! The cast, acting, costumes, zeitgeist are beyond praise. What a pity that such skill is practically lost" (Irina).

"A stunning film with excellent performance by wonderful actors. The picture succinctly and accurately depicts the social life of the St. Petersburg upper and middle strata with their love intrigues, gossip and conspiracies. And above all this fuss rises the image of a simple Russian woman – Sofya Andreevna – an understanding, sincerely loving and forgiving wife, whose main character trait is to accept life's suffering without a murmur. ... The brightest characters in the film are Arkady and his adoptive father Versilov. Arkady wins over with his directness, youthful maximalism, purity of conscience, kindness, understanding and ability to love, perseverance and desire to achieve something in life. If he retains all these qualities in himself, he will achieve a lot, while remaining a decent person. Versilov is partly Arkady in his youth. Kindness, the striving for the highest ideals is still present in him. ... However, Versilov is guided primarily by selfish motives, not thinking about his neighbors. The abstract idea "to make all mankind happy by feeding him "became prevalent in his behavior" (Anastasia).

That Same Munchausen. USSR, 1979. Directed by Mark Zakharov. Screenwriter Grigory Gorin (based on his own play "The Most Truthful"). Actors: Oleg Yankovsky, Inna Churikova, Elena Koreneva, Igor Kvasha, Alexander Abdulov, Leonid Yarmolnik, Yuri Katin–Yartsev, Vladimir Dolinsky, Leonid Bronevoy, Semyon Farada, Vsevolod Larionov and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1980.**

Mark Zakharov (1933–2019) was a famous theater director, however, his films, shot for television ("12 chairs", "Ordinary miracle", "That Same Munchausen", "Formula of love") had great success with the audience.

In the year of the release of the film "That Same Munchausen" on TV screens, Tatyana Iskantseva wrote in the magazine "Television and Radio Broadcasting" that in the version of Grigory Gorin and Mark Zakharov Munchausen "turned out to be different from himself, the former. Young, charming, smart. And most importantly, he inexorably believes in the beauty of dreams and fantasies, in the human right to be himself. In the picture, this faith is, as it were, tested for strength" (Iskantseva, 1980: 26).

Already in the 21st century, theater critic Polina Bogdanova noted that "Munchausen is a famous liar baron who with all his might resisted the generally accepted norms and rules, invented all sorts of fables, claimed to have reached the moon on a cannonball, plunged his tales into the horror of the well-meaning and reasonable fellow citizens. He became, perhaps, the main exponent of the director's creative credo. Munchausen opposed boring and monotonous truth, raising the power of fantasy, fiction, imagination to the shield" (Bogdanova, 2010: 159).

I agree with Alexander Ryaposov: "Munchausen in Zakharov's picture is a really romantic hero – a loner, opposed to everyone else... In Zakharov's Munchausen, absurdistic motives inherent in the drama of paradox are revealed. This also applies to the main collision of the picture (who has become the talk of the town, the notorious liar Munchausen in the work of Zakharov and Gorin is the most truthful, and those who surround him, including his beloved and best friend, are lying), and the entire artistic fabric of the telecast, in the logic of which the norm is, for example, the situation when Munchausen goes hunting without a gun precisely because he goes hunting. The paradoxical nature of Munchausen's actions or his statements is sometimes marked by mischief, slyness, as, for example, the stories of the baron about his conversations with Sophocles, Newton and Shakespeare, but on the whole it is presented in the Zakharov television film quite seriously. ... The director placed the hero of O. Yankovsky in a world where a person has nothing to rely on, because neither love, nor friendship, nor life-creation have been able to perform an ordinary

miracle; the baron has no choice but to leave this world. Such a plot did not fit well into the optimistic picture of the world inherent in official Soviet art, where every person is initially happy only because he is the builder of communism. ... So in the open final of *Munchausen*, the hero of O. Yankovsky says, addressing the camera, directly to the audience: "I understand what your trouble is, you are too serious. A clever face is not yet a sign of intelligence, gentlemen. All the nonsense on earth is done with this expression. Smile, gentlemen, smile!..." ... In other words, for all the severity of the diagnosis made by Zakharov of our time, the director left hope at least for the future" (Ryaposov, 2016: 83, 91–92).

And here the film critic Alexander Sedov reasonably notes: "Who would have thought that such a change would happen to Baron Munchausen: from a vaudeville hero of a children's fairy tale, he would turn into a subtle intellectual, a paradoxical thinker, an unrecognized philosopher, spouting witticisms and aphorisms. According to him, he regularly communicates with the greatest minds of humanity: with Shakespeare, Newton, Giordano Bruno, that is, with people who have lived in different centuries – live, personally, as an equal with equals. ... The lie and the adventurer Munchausen, whom we knew earlier from the tales of Rudolf Raspe, could not dream of such a thing, and not because of a lack of imagination, but because he addressed his tales to a mass audience who likes to listen to "horror films" about heads flying on the Moon, rather than leafing through the works of abstruse sages. Playwright Grigory Gorin made a "glorious revolution" with respect to Munchausen: he elevated the celebrated hero to a head or even two higher than his admirers - and around the familiar character from childhood a sharp dramatic conflict was formed: the artist against society. The tangled family circumstances of our Munchausen, his quarrels with those in power are like chains on the feet of a freedom-loving baron. Munchausen from Mark Zakharov's film is the wizard from an "Ordinary Miracle" halfway through Swift's silent and locked up in his house. Munchausen's house is not yet a prison or a madhouse, but it is already a socially besieged fortress. Unlike the book one, our Munchausen already has a character, not a mask. He is able to delight the audience and disappoint those close to him. He has weaknesses, but you can not call him a wimp. As a creative person he is a pronounced egocentric" (Sedov, 2012).

As a result, the ironic parable "That Same Munchausen" became, in my opinion, one of the best works of Grigory Gorin, Mark Zakharov and Oleg Yankovsky, *interest in which from the audience still continues*:

"I have no words to describe the impression that this masterpiece makes on me with each new viewing. It's not just a favorite movie – it's more than that. In general, a lot can be said about a person, judging by his attitude to this picture. ... I noticed a long time ago that all of Zakharov's works differ in depth (which, unfortunately, even their fans do not always realize!), But this one is probably especially. Personally, throughout the entire film, I do not get tired of admiring Munchausen – this strongest person, ready to defend his truth to the last. And after all, de facto, he almost defeated the people around him, deceitful and down-to-earth – how they get lost in response to his witty remarks! But outwardly, they are all stronger than him, and oh, how difficult it is to resist this faceless mass... True, Munchausen succeeded, and he would have reached the victorious end, if not ... beloved, it seems like the closest and understanding person. ... When I watch the final scene, I get a strange, difficult to explain feeling that sometimes visits me ... of unity with eternity, or what? ... Plus, the melody, of course, is an absolutely extraordinary melody. It somehow reminds me of the beautiful music that I sometimes hear in my sleep – then I enjoy it, and when I wake up I completely forget it, I only remember that the sounds were just great. Permeated with a motive of light sadness, and even this organ ... As for the actual rise of Munchausen to heaven, this is not just some kind of movement, but a whole symbol, and it can be interpreted in completely different ways. I counted five interpretations. And that he sacrifices his life for the sake of righteousness, and that this means the immortality of his soul... But the closest idea to me is this: he would still go to the Moon (if he wasn't Karl Hieronymus Friedrich!), and then in many thousands of years he would come back... Clearly, none of the people living there will be left, but maybe there will be new people, a new society – of truth, not of lies" (Anita).

"I love this film very much. For me, he is not just a picture filled with tales of the baron's adventures. This is philosophy, and sparkling, caustic, Zakharov's humor. ... The star cast, rare in talent, follows the director's ideas in unison. And Oleg Yankovsky made his hero not just a cheerful inventor and dreamer, but supplemented his image with intelligence, sadness and protest against

the accepted rules. Indeed, in fact, comic situations are followed by a hidden subtext of the picture precisely in the fact that a person who refuses to follow generally accepted norms and has his own free thoughts should either be expelled from society or punished. How many thinkers, scientists and inventors in their time suffered from this, when their genius was ridiculed and not recognized. So for me this picture, first of all, is a tragicomedy, where there are both funny and sad sides. And the film of course, bravo! One of the best Russian paintings, which has already become a favorite classics" (N. Martyanova).

"That Same Munchausen" is a reference film model of the witty dissenting community of creative dissidents of the era of Leonid Brezhnev. Probably, contemporaries – intellectuals, watching this then, in the year of the premiere, were delighted. But the film is really good and still. Perhaps the best film creation by Mark Zakharov, and Grigory Gorin is generally a brilliant playwright and satirist, a master of phrases, sayings and inverted maxims. ... A masterpiece film. And the music of Alexei Rybnikov, he is also one of the creators of the mood" (D. Jump).

"The film "That Same Munchausen" is simply magnificent, we never stop remembering and citing it in different situations" (Elena).

Well, and, of course, there are spectators, somewhat similar to the opponents of Zakharov's Munchausen:

"The film was unambiguously shot by Zakharov with a dissident overtones. ... The main thing is that the authors are dragging through a radically perverted idea that the whole society around "lives by lies", only one Baron Munchausen is not lying. Although if you think about it, it turns out to be complete nonsense, as well as all Munchausen's ideas about May 32, the war with England, heroic flights on a combat core, etc. For the entourage, Germany of the 18th century was taken, but all the hints are more than transparent: Munchausen is a dissident balancing between a psychiatric hospital, prison and execution, the Duke is fixated on embroidery – Brezhnev, naturally, fallen into insanity, the war with England – the introduction of our troops into Afghanistan (held as once a year when the film is released)" (Andrey V.).

"What the baron does is not dissent, but shocking. He is not in the least against the authorities. Declared war on England? Yeah, when the Americans and their allies had already defeated the British, just in time – that is how Brazil defeated Hitler. Disperses the clouds? Every day – and not a drop of rain or snowflakes over Hanover for decades? No, it accelerates when they disperse themselves. ... I calculated on May 32, ah, what a fine fellow. Calculated incorrectly, but it's not bad. The scientific result (if the baron himself considers it scientific, not pop) should have been reported at the nearest university, and not in court. And so what happened? Cubic roll, ball-shaped drag. He destroyed his own greenhouse. Flowers – what are they to blame?" (Fred).

"This film has always made me uncomfortable. ... Sadly, sadly. In everything, disorder and discomfort. Music intensifies melancholy. The film is mercilessly drawn out – it was this circumstance that prevented me from watching it to the end at the next attempt. Munchausen is outraged, as outraged by a person who considers everyone around as fools, and only himself – the smartest and most knowledgeable, not listening to anyone and not seeing anything around him. The man decided that all the secrets of the universe are in his palm, which is why the smile – ironic, mocking, condescending, does not leave his face. Why should everyone, no, just have to jump for happiness when Munchausen announces an "extra" day? What is happiness? And why should everyone immediately accept this dubious statement unconditionally? ... The acting is excellent. But the impressions of the film are heavy, depressing. Apparently, some allegorical malicious messages put into it by the authors are energetically negative. Not a bright film" (Leta).

Theatre. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Jānis Streičs (based on the novel of the same name by Somerset Maugham) Actors: Vija Artmane, Gunars Cilinskis, Elza Radzinja, Ivars Kalnins, Peteris Gaudins, Valentins Skulme, Maya Eglite, Ilga Vitola, Eduards Pavuls and others.
TV premiere: March 31, 1979.

Jānis Streičs directed 22 full-length feature films ("Captain Enrico's Watch", "Shoot for Me", "Remember or Forget", etc.), but the most famous of them was the "Theater".

Almost all famous Latvian actors of the 1970s played in this costume melodrama from “English life”. The popularity of Vija Artmane (1929–2008) and Gunars Cilinskis (1931–1992) was by that time already all-Union, which contributed to the success of this television movie, which has many fans today:

“I love this movie. ... Vija Artmane is just an actress with a very capital letter, and what beautiful photographs were shown of her (remember, she laid them on the floor)” (Elena G.).

“Excellent film adaptation, respect for the original source, Maugham's novel. The spirit of the novel, subtle irony, the relationship of the characters are conveyed. The acting is beyond praise, even the episodic roles are brilliantly played” (Emma).

“I don't know who is the most handsome man in London, but at one time Gunar Cilinskis was one of the most handsome men in the USSR. Awesome movie. I know it by heart, but every time I find new interesting moments in it” (Lana).

Three in the Boat (To Say Nothing of the Dog). USSR, 1979. Directed by Naum Birman. Screenwriter Semyon Lungin (based on the story by Jerome K. Jerome). Actors: Andrei Mironov, Alexander Shirvindt, Mikhail Derzhavin, Larisa Golubkina, Alina Pokrovskaya, Irina Mazurkevich, Zinoviy Gerdt, Grigory Shpigel, Yuri Katin-Yartsev, Georgy Shtil, Tatiana Peltzer and others. **TV premiere: May 4, 1979.**

Best director's work by **Naum Birman (1924–1989)**, undoubtedly, the war drama “Chronicle of a Dive Bomber” (1966), but the audience is well aware of his other notable films – “The Singing Teacher” and “Three in the Boat (To Say Nothing of the Dog)”.

It is not an easy task to convey Jerome K. Jerome's English humor on the screen, and it seems to many viewers of the 21st century that the director did not succeed. However, the comedy of N. Birman today has many fans who admire the acting of the trio of Andrei Mironov, Alexander Shirvindt and Mikhail Derzhavin.

“Pro”:

“Great movie. Really like. Excellent acting” (S. Shoylitsa). “The film is simple, light and quite watchable” (Norvikova). “A very good movie. Brilliant film adaptation. ... I liked all the characters. Especially the main ones are Mironov, Shirvindt, Derzhavin. ... I laughed so hard. Looked in the room late, when mine were already asleep. And my laughter woke them up. They woke up and also began to laugh and watch the film with me” (Valera).

“Contra”:

“I didn't like the film at all. Each of the actors just admires themselves and the director's work leaves much to be desired! Only the dog is adorable. She alone played sincerely. Of course, to convey the humor of the author of the book, you have to try very hard, but here no one tried. Not a film, but a fable about the Swan, Cancer and Pike. Each his own, and the result is a bad film” (Elena).

“I don't like this movie. Jerome is the epitome of English humor, and it takes a lot of effort to adequately reproduce it. Alas, Naum Birman followed a very simple path – to catch up with wonderful actors in the film and force them to get out of their own way” (M. Kirillov).

“The other day this film was repeated on TV. I tried to look – it does not go. Yes, this is understandable – filmed forty years ago, it is not one of those films that look even better over the years. I remember when I was a child, when I was reading a book, I was hysterical with laughter. ... In the film, the director safely passed all the funny episodes of the book. His reckoning was on nationwide love, and not at all on the desire to convey the spirit of the novel” (E. Logoev).

Tobacco Captain. USSR, 1972. Directed by Igor Usov. Scriptwriter Vladimir Vorobyov (based on the comedy of the same name by N. Aduv). Actors: Vladlen Davydov, Natalya Fateeva, Nikolay Trofimov, Sergey Filippov, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Georgy Vitsin and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1972.**

Igor Usov (1928–1990) directed 11 films, mainly of entertainment genres. Musical comedy “Tobacco Captain” is one of his most famous works.

The "Tobacco Captain" still has a lot of fans, although some viewers still argue over which of the actors succeeded (or failed) roles in this film:

"I always watch with pleasure this musical comedy from the times of Peter the Great. The cast here is generally wonderful, and Tsvetkov's music is very memorable, the dialogues and lyrics are witty. The film was shot in the scenery, but it looks quite cinematic, does not produce the feeling of theatricality. But I don't really like Fateeva here either. Too mature for a young girl, it seems that the type is not very suitable" (B. Nezhdanov).

"An interesting action, like a film, but also a musical performance in deliberately simple decorations, and even with a little animation. Actors, regardless of the quality of their musical and dancing abilities, fully participated in the numbers" (Kamenogradsky).

"Great movie. Natalia Fateeva is a very talented actress. For example, Gurchenko cannot free himself from the pop genre ... Fateeva does not have this lack. In all her roles, she lives in them, including in this role" (Halov).

"When I see this film on TV, I watch it with great pleasure. How incredibly beautiful the beauty Fateeva is" (Kartsev).

Tony Wendis's Mistake. USSR, 1981. Directed by Vasile Brescanu. Screenwriter Alexander Jurowski (based on the play "The Phone Call" by Frederick Knott). Actors: Igor Kostolevsky, Milena Tontegode, Valdas Yatautis, Alexander Filippenko, Paul Butkevich and others. **TV premiere: April 11, 1982.**

Vasile Brescanu (1940–2010) directed nine full-length feature films, but the audience remembered mainly his detective "Tony Wendis's Mistake."

Frederick Knott's play "The Phone Call" has already been filmed earlier by Alfred Hitchcock, his film was called "Dial M for Murder" (1954).

However, in 1982, few Soviet television viewers saw the Hitchcock film, so the version of V. Brescanu with the then star of Soviet cinema Igor Kostolevsky was perceived without any associations.

Detective Brescanu was made soundly, the cast was not bad, hence the considerable success with the audience, not yet spoiled by Western detectives and thrillers.

Many viewers still refer to "Tony Wendis' Mistake" is quite warm:

"Great movie with a twisted plot and acting, and very, very stylish" (Lightpower).

"The film is, of course, very interesting, with a complicated story... Actors' clothes were fashionable at that time, and even now some things are still relevant. The stylish interior of the studio apartment was also a novelty for the Soviet audience, and against its background electronic music, then also very fashionable. Kostolevsky is certainly handsome, dandy. Filippenko is one of my favorite actors, somehow charismatic, always with a kind of steel twinkle in his eyes" (Gul).

"We are accustomed to the fact that, as a rule, directors entrusted Igor Kostolevsky with the roles of positive characters. And here he has such a cold, cruel look, such a cynical grin with outward benevolence and sincerity that it makes an indelible impression. Bravo to the actor! Thanks to the filmmakers, I like it for a long time. The power of the effect is not in pursuits, gunfights, stunts – no. All the action takes place practically in one apartment, in one room. And the feeling of danger, psychological stress is produced by the play of actors and the plot" (Dense provincial woman).

"A good film... A worthy cast – Kostolevsky and Filippenko, Butkevich, Tontegode... An impressive soundtrack – "Pink Floyd", "Tangerine Dream", "Kraftwerk"... In general, everything is pretty" (Victor).

Trust That Burst. USSR, 1982. Directed by Alexander Pavlovsky. Screenwriter Igor Shevtsov (based on the stories of O. Henry). Actors: Regimantas Adomaitis, Nikolay Karachentsov, Mikhail Sribny, Victor Ilyichev, Yuri Volovich, Vsevolod Abdulov, Boris Borovsky, Mikhail Muromov, Leonid Kuravlev, Mikhail Svetin, Irina Ponarovskaya, Vladimir Basov, Pavel Vinnik, Boris Novikov and others. **TV premiere: March 18, 1983.**

Alexander Pavlovsky (1947–2018) directed two dozen full-length feature films and series ("Ar–hi–me–dy!", "Trust That Burst", "Marshmallow in Chocolate", etc.), but the most famous of them, of course, "Green Van".

The comedy "Trust That Burst", thanks to its confident direction and a good acting ensemble, is still loved by the audience.

Here is just one typical viewer review: "Awesome movie. I love it. O. Henry's humor combined with the music of Max Dunaevsky creates a unique charm. American comedies – "nervously smoking nearby" (Vladimir).

Turbins' Days. USSR, 1976. Director and screenwriter Vladimir Basov (based on the play of the same name by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Andrei Myagkov, Andrei Rostotsky, Valentina Titova, Oleg Basilashvili, Vladimir Basov, Vasily Lanovoy, Pyotr Shcherbakov, Sergei Ivanov, Vladimir Samoilov, Gleb Strizhenov and others. **TV premiere: November 1, 1976.**

Vladimir Basov (1923–1987) made 19 films, 10 of which ("Shield and Sword", "Battle on the Way", "Silence", "Life Passed By", "School of Courage", "Case at Mine Eight", "Return to Life", "An Unusual Summer", "Blizzard", "Nylon 100%") entered the one thousand highest-grossing Soviet films. However, V. Basov's television film "Turbins' Days" was and remains very popular among the mass audience.

As Alexander Tarasov writes, in the film "Turbins's Days", "the cold and dispassionate image of 1918 is alarming and even frightening, therefore, when Turbines suddenly appear against its background, you immediately feel a sense of closeness and trust to them. And this contrast at the very beginning of the film, in our opinion, is not accidental. Bulgakov and the author of the film V.P. Basov sharply opposes this family to the whole image of 1918, which carries horror, death, pain. We clearly understand the position of the authors in relation to this family. Thus, the main themes of the film, play and novel are the theme of the family and the theme of the House" (Tarasov, 2006: 14).

The audience is still arguing about this outstanding film, defending their vision of the play by Mikhail Bulgakov and paying tribute to the ensemble of talented actors:

"In my opinion, Basov, as a director, showed his professional genius here. In the film "Turbins' Days" he revealed his talent as a director, in my opinion, even much more than in "Shield and Sword". Basov was able to convey that terrible time for Russia – the time of changes, which did not bring anything good not only for the Turbins family, but also for the entire Russian aristocracy and the intelligentsia as a whole" (Ulan).

"I am absolutely delighted, the film made such a strong impression that it is difficult to describe. The spirit of Bulgakov is conveyed ..., the actors play gorgeous ... The atmosphere, liveliness, naturalness ... As if it really was, and was filmed with a hidden camera" (Natalya).

"The film is simply a masterpiece of our cinema. ... Great ensemble of actors! Those who say that A. Myagkov is not suitable for the role of A. Turbin simply cannot switch from one image he created to a completely opposite character. ... Each scene he played is the hero's lived and tortured life! And what image was created by Andrey Rostotsky! He is alive! Direct! Present!" (Tatyana).

Two Captains. USSR, 1976. Directed by Evgeny Karelov. Screenwriters: Evgeny Karelov, Veniamin Kaverin (based on the novel of the same name by Veniamin Kaverin). Actors: Boris Tokarev, Seryozha Kudryavtsev, Elena Prudnikova, Yuri Bogatyrev, Nikolai Gritsenko, Irina Pechernikova, Zinaida Kirienko, Natalia Egorova, Ira Klimenko, Yuri Kuzmenkov, Vladimir Zamansky, Mikhail Pugovkin and others. **TV premiere: February 26, 1977.**

Evgeny Karelov (1931–1977) directed 9 full-length feature films, four of which ("The Third Half", "Children of Don Quixote", "Two Comrades Served", "I – Shapovalov T.P.") were included in the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films. But, of course, his series "Two

Captains", based on the novel of the same name by Veniamin Kaverin (1902–1989), was also very popular.

Unfortunately, "Two Captains" was destined to become the last work of the talented director Yevgeny Karelov. In the summer of 1977, he went to rest at the House of Filmmakers in Pitsunda. On a fatal day for himself – July 11 – he went to swim in the sea, and then he suddenly had a heart attack – death came instantly. Evgeny Karelov at that time was only 45 years old...

Viewers' opinions about this adaptation of "Two Captains" were and are very different. Fans of Kaverin's novel are often unhappy with the changes in the plot and the choice of actors for the main roles. Fans of the film, on the contrary, are happy with everything, and they never cease to admire this romantic picture:

"This is not just a film, but a film masterpiece. Of course, no small merit in the famously twisted plot. Usually I either like the movie better or the book. Then there was that rare case when I watched the film several times with pleasure, and read the book twice" (Edith).

"Great movie. I would even say, one of the best in our cinema. The actors are very well chosen. B. Tokarev is simply magnificent here. Both the artist himself and his hero. In general, you can list everyone here without exception" (Natasha).

"I don't like the film at all. ... Sluggish, non-atmospheric, boring. And the further, the worse. ... In short, just a complete collapse. It's a shame for the book. And sorry for my broken hopes" (Vaira).

Vacation at Your Own Expense. USSR–Hungary, 1981 Directed by Victor Titov. Screenwriters Valentin Azernikov, Andras Polgar. Actors: Olga Melikhova, Igor Kostolevsky, Miklos Kalochai, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Elena Romanova, Vladimir Basov, Marianna Strizhenova, Alexander Shirvindt, Lyubov Polishchuk, Igor Yasulovich, Liya Akhedzhakova and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1982.**

Victor Titov (1939–2000) staged twenty full-length feature films and series (among them – "Ilf and Petrov Rode in the Tram", "Hello, I'm Your Aunt!", "Open Book", "Adam Marries Eve", "Vacation at Own Account", "Life of Klim Samgin" and others).

In the melodramatic comedy "Vacation at Own Account", the main stake, of course, was made on the popularity of Igor Kostolevsky, however, according to the plan of one of the film's playwrights, Valentin Ozernikov, it was supposed to be a duet of two stars: the script was originally written with Evgenia Simonova in mind.

For some reason, Victor Titov did not take pictures of Evgenia Simonova and chose the actress Lyubov Rudenko, who, in turn, was not approved by her superiors, replacing her with Olga Melikhova, who as a result brilliantly played the role of a kindergarten teacher from a provincial city, who fell in love with her head in the capital ladies' man.

The third most important role in the film was brilliantly played by a Hungarian actor Miklos Kalochai (1950–1991), unfortunately, passed away very early...

Not everyone knows that Mikhail Boyarsky also starred in "Vacation at His Own Expense," but his role (along with an extended scene in the shower) remained only for the Hungarian version. Boyarsky's role was cut out of the Soviet version of the film by order of his superiors...

Thank God, the authorities did not encroach on other supporting roles, brilliantly played by Lyudmila Gurchenko, Alexander Shirvindt and Vladimir Basov...

Today's viewers often recall Holidays with nostalgia:

"When I watch this film, I feel very sad and painful at heart. It is difficult to get used to the idea that it was once, but you cannot bring back either that era or those people. How I envy my parents! How lucky they are, and how unlucky we are – the generation of the 1980s! What surrounds us now? What are we living with? What are we becoming? There is no soul in us, but only anger and hatred ... It is sad, painful. Where are you, Katya? Struggling to survive at IKEA? Tell me is everything really so hopeless? Or I'm wrong..." (Masha).

"The film is wonderful. He came out on the screen when, like Katya, I was growing up, getting bumps, falling in love and being disappointed. In my opinion, the ending of the film is far from

optimistic, she was not waiting for the one who came. What a disappointment in her eyes!" (Helena).

"A film of some extraordinary charm. He is so bright and optimistic! ... And what is Gurchenko! First – a snide and unpleasant aunt, and then we see a kind, not very happy woman" (Betty).

"I saw this film for the first time sometime in 1987. I was 12 years old... Who impressed me the most from this film was the Hungarian actor Miklos Kalochai, who played Laszlo, a friend of Yura (Kostolevsky)! Then, to me – a 12-year-old girl, he seemed so handsome! Probably, it was only because of him that the film intrigued me, and seemed more intense, vivid. And then they showed Hungary, the capital of Budapest and its beauty... It fascinated me so much! This country seemed to me some kind of warm, colorful, I wanted to live there. ... So, while watching this film, I thought with indignation – how could you not notice and ignore Laszlo because of this "idiot Yura" (may I. Kostolevsky forgive me)?! ... With my childish logic, I decided – in her place, no matter what, I would choose Laszlo and go with him to his country! ... In general, the film is good, funny in places, I still love him!" (Hum).

Variant "Omega". USSR, 1975. Directed by Antonis Voyazos. Scriptwriters Nikolai Leonov, Y. Kostrov (based on his own story "Operation "Viking"). Actors: Oleg Dal, Igor Vasiliev, Elena Prudnikova, Irina Pechernikova, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vadim Yakovlev, Sergey Polezhaev, Paul Kalde, Alexander Kalyagin, Alexey Eybozhenko, Fedor Nikitin, Vitaly Konyaev and others. **TV premiere: September 15, 1975.**

Director Antonis–Janis Voyazos (1930–1992) for his creative biography, he directed only three feature films (the first of them was a short), and was remembered by the audience only for the military detective series "Variant "Omega".

The life of Antonis–Janis Voyazos is in itself worthy of an action-packed novel or film. He was born in Thessaloniki, a young eighteen-year-old communist with his companions in the Greek Communist Party, hijacked a plane, for which he was sentenced to death in absentia. It is clear that with such a verdict, the young communist only had to flee to the USSR. There he first worked as a turner, studied for a couple of years at the Tashkent Theater and Art Institute, and then moved to Moscow, to VGIK, where he studied in the workshop of Mikhail Romm. Voyazos made his first two feature films in the 1960s. "Variant "Omega" became his last work in the USSR, soon after its premiere, the director returned to his homeland, where he continued his creative activity – in literature, cinema and theater...

The plot of the film "Variant "Omega" was built on a psychological duel between two opponents – scout Skorin (Oleg Dal) and Baron von Schlosser (Igor Vasiliev)...

Exactly Antonis–Janis Voyazos insisted that Oleg Dal (1941–1981) played the role of the Soviet intelligence officer operating in the occupied Tallinn in 1942, which is why the film crew jokingly called this TV project "Variant of Oleg"...

The Soviet film press met this film ambiguously.

For example, film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) wrote that in the "Variant "Omega" "with rare thoroughness and variety... it was the cuisine of the exploration craft that was revealed. We see a system of worked-out operations, to which the enemy responds with his own operations, and these moves are clear, like on a chessboard – the question is who has thought out the position more deeply and whose move will be the last. I. Vasiliev plays the German intelligence officer von Schlosser cool and energetic. Constantly alert, very attentive to the interlocutor, his hero is intoxicated with professional power, but he also has a share of irony that softens self-confidence. He can, stumbling in mid-sentence, half-phrase, instantly withdraw into himself, as if to re-run the entire chain of chess substantiations of his conclusions. Arrogant and arrogant, prone to loud tirades, he becomes almost defenseless, when he encounters something that is not taken into account by him, that eludes analysis. In a fight with this brutal force, the Soviet intelligence agent Skorin will have to gradually subjugate it, force it to serve other purposes. Skorin's role got to play O. Dal. Where another director, taking into account the originality of the dramatic material, would probably choose an "open" performer, whose state of mind is instantly reflected as a shadow on his

face, A. Voyazos preferred an artist who possessed a rare ability to contact without an echo, and willingly emphasized this to hell. Skorin performed by Dal is not a genius, not mediocrity, but a riddle, riddle and riddle. He is silent, looks with a burning, hard look, opens his mouth to throw a short remark, but even here everything is vague: either bravado pretends to look like a manifestation of seriousness, or the serious is presented as a game. What is not taken into account by him, what eludes analysis. In a fight with this brutal force, the Soviet intelligence agent Skorin will have to gradually subjugate it, force it to serve other purposes.

The duel of the scouts becomes a fight between David and Goliath. The interest here is in the very exchange of blows, in explaining why, how and when Skorin, seemingly helpless, outwitted the ace of German military intelligence. Isn't this why the kitchen of the exploration craft, so ostentatiously opened at the beginning, is needed in the film? But no, the script is deceiving us. For some time, the plot seems to be walking on two legs, the points of view of the opposing sides in the image alternate. But at some point, not marked by anything, we begin to look at Skorin only from the outside. Previously, we knew about his feelings, intentions and actions, but now we can only guess about them. The effect of an unexpected ending from this naturally increases, but isn't it too expensive? Skorin, it turns out, patiently forged the weapon of his future victory in silence, but why was it concealed from us? As a result, the duel ceased to be a duel. It has become a traditional adventure action. Three long rounds, three full series out of five, we watched a confident game with one goal, when suddenly, summing up the results, we were told that the defending team had won, because such and such blows were made that we had never had before. representation. Schlosser won, and Skorin won. Aren't we glad? We are very happy, but also discouraged. Discouraged along with Schlosser. He was cheated and lost, we won, but we also feel cheated in the scenario" (Demin, 1981).

Already in post-Soviet times, film critic Anastasia Krainer argued that in the "Variant "Omega" "the viewer is confused, led through the labyrinths of the perverted consciousness of a real spy and enchanted. The film is like a box with surprises: the riddles of the plot give way to the lyrical feelings of the hero, the twists and turns of the plot – a deep reflection of a keenly feeling character. ... The hero really turned out to be some kind of "mirror" – in him the character of the actor was reflected even more than Dal had planned. Skorin is not a superman, but not an extra either. He is a man – a paradox. A character from the breed of those eternal wanderers, to which Oleg Dal belonged. Skorin's charm is most evident when Dal himself sings the central song of the film "Where is he this day." At that moment, the viewer acutely feels the special intonation, which murmurs Chekhov's "undercurrent" between the lines, between subtle characters throughout the entire movie. Voyazos had no intention of competing with other intelligence series. He created his film, in which the accents have shifted towards simplicity, soulfulness, light shades of love and compassion. The director made the right decision not only with Skorin – Dal. The image of Baron Georg von Schlosser performed by the Moscow Art Theater actor Igor Vasiliev was very successful" (Krainer, 2008).

A. Muradov and K. Shergova note that "Variant "Omega", one of the last Soviet multi-part films about the achievements of the special services during the Great Patriotic War, offered the viewer a new image: instead of a cold and, to some extent, someone else's scout, another character appeared – a highly professional soldier, whose human weaknesses were not hidden, but emphasized. Thus, the viewer could see himself in this hero, in contrast to the predecessors of such characters. In addition, the formation of the image of the "smart enemy" has reached a new level, the main antagonist evokes not only admiration, but also, to some extent, sympathy. And, consequently, the duel between such characters attracts more interest" (Muradov, Shergova, 2019: 63–64).

The opinions of today's viewers about the "Variant "Omega" are often opposite – from complete delight to complete denial, spurred on by the search for "blunders":

"I love "Variant "Omega" very much, how wonderful all the actors are here! This is what is called "piece work". The most interesting thing in the film is the confrontation between Schlosser and Skorin, an amazing psychological game of two wonderful actors" (Mikhail).

"I do not at all consider the role of Skorin to be Dal's great acting success. In their confrontation with Schlosser–Vasiliev, the latter looks both stronger and more convincing. I don't know whether it was an insidious idea of a Greek director, or simply Vasiliev had a "chemical

reaction" of getting used to the image, while Dal did not because of the notorious factor of "not his own character". In general, the Germans in the film are shown in an extremely interesting and diverse way. Moreover, the central point of the film is not at all the nominal confrontation between "ours and theirs", but an internal conflict in the camp of the enemy. The aristocrat is the intellectual von Schlosser, forced against his will and convictions to serve the "dictatorship of small shopkeepers" and the cattle-breeder Maggil, personifying this very dictatorship ("Got fat, bald, rose in rank, but did not grow wiser ... rather the opposite." Isn't that so caustic?). And Vasiliev and Kalyagin are playing out their parts as if by notes. From the so-called. "Ours" remember Evstigneev in the role of a major of state security: his look, cold courtesy, from which frost on the skin. It seems that the actor knew about this sinister organization something that we mere mortals in the seventies did not know and tried to put into the image much more than was in the script. And Dal in this film ... famously wears a German field uniform, skillfully plays the Russian booze (well, this is not surprising), frames the charming young Fischbach, in general does not spoil the picture, "Dal's way" is sweet, "Dal's way" charming, but nothing more" (E. Heindrich).

"Well, why did Soviet directors treat the texture of the war years so negligently? Were there really no normal consultants in uniform, military equipment?" (S. Petrov).

Visit to the Minotaur. USSR, 1987. Directed by Eldor Urazbayev. Screenwriters Arkady Vayner, Georgy Vayner (based on his own novel). Actors: Sergey Shakurov, Anna Kamenkova, Vladimir Samoilov, Rostislav Plyatt, Alexander Filippenko, Valentin Gaft, Mikhail Pugovkin, Laimonas Noreika, Lev Borisov, Grigory Lampe, Svetlana Kharitonova, Marina Levtova, Valentin Nikulin, Nina Menshikova and others. **TV premiere: November 9, 1987.**

Eldor Urazbayev (1940–2012) directed 15 full-length feature films and TV series, three of which ("Transsiberian Express", "Look in both", "Traffic police inspector") were included in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films. The detective "Visit to the Minotaur" was probably his most popular television movie.

The action of "Visit to the Minotaur" took place in different centuries, and the intrigue was in the search for the stolen Stradivarius violin...

Alexander Bezzubtsev–Kondakov notes that "in the last decade of the existence of the Soviet Union, a number of films have been released on the screens, united by the theme of "mixing of eras": this is "Guest from the Future" by P. Arsenov (1985), and "Visit to the Minotaur" by E. Urazbayev (1987), and "A Mirror for a Hero" by V. Khotinenko (1987), and "Entrance to the Labyrinth" by V. Kremnev (1989). These films reflect the feeling of the fragility of time, the historical gap between the decrepit Soviet empire and the new social system, which had been born in agony since the mid-1980s. For Soviet people, time ceased to be monolithic, lost its shape and became fluid, and the past turned out to be contradictory..." (Bezzubtsev–Kondakov, 2011: 131–132).

The opinions of today's viewers about "Visit to the Minotaur" are mostly very positive, this applies not only to the work of the director and screenwriters, but also to the acting works of Sergei Shakurov, Anna Kamenkova, Rostislav Plyatt, Alexander Filippenko, Valentin Gaft, etc.:

"I really liked this film, it was a successful combination of criminal and historical lines. ... Old people play beyond praise. ... Mikhail Pugovkin, in general, played, in my opinion, his best role... The scene of the interrogation of master Melnik by prosecutor Uvarov is just a standard of acting skills of two wonderful actors Mikhail Pugovkin and Vladimir Samoilov. This is not just a classic confrontation between "a criminal and a policeman", it is a dispute between two worldviews. ... Excellent, classic cinema of the 1980s" (Andrey).

"I would like to note the excellent performance of Shakurov. Here it is – the feminine ideal of a real man. ... Shakurov's pauses and the look in his eyes are incomparable. Everything is there – the triumph of victory, and confusion, and tenderness in relation to the woman he loves. Super-actor! ... Filippenko plays awesome, especially in one of the last scenes with a tuning fork, when the level of acting just rolls over – from the role of a frightened little man to a giant monster – a minotaur. The performer of the role of Guarneri, Nikolai Denisov, evokes special feelings: it is simply fabulous, subtly sensitive and makes you cry to tears" (Reinmud).

"I love the film very much, I always watch it. This is where the excellent script and the superb acting do their job, because if you took it all away, it would have turned out to be an ordinary, unremarkable detective story. Scenario development, great dialogues make this film really special in its genre. What are the monologues of Plyatt – Amati worth!" (Lika).

But there are also critical opinions, reproaches that "setting out the "historical part of the plot", the authors have greatly crossed the border of what is permissible, which can be explained by "fictional fiction". ... for such tricks it is quite possible to be held accountable (for) too free interpretation of biographies of famous historical figures. ... I think that the "idea" of the crime itself and its execution itself are not fully thought out: a criminal who at every step forgets about evidence..." (Sergei).

Walking Through the Torments. USSR, 1977. Directed by Vasily Ordynsky. Screenwriters Vasily Ordynsky, Oleg Stukalov–Pogodin (based on the novel by Alexei Tolstoy). Actors: Irina Alferova, Svetlana Penkina, Yuri Solomin, Mikhail Nozhkin, Vyacheslav Ezevov, Mikhail Kozakov, Inna Gulaya, Georgy Burkov, Andrey Yurenev, Alexander Pashutin, Laimonas Noreika, Alexander Lazarev, Sergey Nikonenko, Nikolay Eremenko, Lev Borisov, Anatoliy Yuri Kayurov, Nikolai Afanasyev, Vladimir Gostyukhin, Mikhail Golubovich, Nikolai Zasukhin, Semyon Morozov, Lidia Fedoseeva–Shukshina, Georgy Svetlani, Rolan Bykov, Alexander Filippenko, Konstantin Grigoriev, Anna Kamenkova, Zinoviy Gerdt and others. **Premiere on TV: October 19, 1977.**

Vasily Ordynsky (1923–1985) directed 11 full-length feature films, three of which ("Peers", "A Man Was Born", "Clouds Over Borsk") were included in the 1000 highest-grossing Soviet films (and this is not counting the popular television series "Walking Through the Torment").

Compared to the film adaptation of Alexei Tolstoy's novel in the interpretation of Grigory Roshal (1899–1983), Vasily Ordynsky's series is larger, multi-figured, attentive to details. In my opinion, despite all the ideological overtones inherent in Soviet cinema, Vasily Ordynsky's "Walking Through the Torments" still looks much more interesting than the Russian TV series of the same name directed by Konstantin Khudyakov. I'm not even talking about the acting ensemble: Vasily Ordynsky is very strong.

Shortly after the premiere of this series, literary critic and film critic Lev Anninsky (1934–2019) wrote that here the director "Ordynsky loves things, he shows the material base of culture, but it is the base of culture, not everyday still lifes. The idea leaves this culture, its soul dies – and everything disintegrates. Things and objects remain. A woman becomes a beautiful thing, nothing more – that is where the "exhibition" elegance of S. Penkina in the role of Katya comes from. The old culture is disintegrating – who then needs a sense of duty and honor rooted in Roshchin? – this is where the dry mechanicality conveyed by M. Nozhkin in this role comes from – the very "inertia" that drives the hero through torment until he finds his way to the revived Motherland, to its new culture, because outside of the spiritual culture, mental, everyday, aesthetic, behavioral, state – a person is unthinkable. This is the theme of Ordynsky: tragically renewed, purifying itself in a revolutionary fire, a reviving culture. The revolutionary storm is recreated on the screen in a different way, not by the means to which the cinema has accustomed us. We are more accustomed, perhaps, to a storm, a blizzard, the elements, to streams, in which an individual person is not always discernible. Cinema as an art brought forth a lot of its original heroes – the geniuses of Soviet cinema at its inception wrote a lot about this. ... V. Ordynsky traces this birth of a new culture in the throes of chaos. Most of all he hates the anarchist spill-rasperry, where the base emerges in a person. Is this not the origin of Makhno's image: no "romantic" and nothing "terrible" – a slightly swollen face, elementary reflexes, – an eerie ordinariness, determined to be extremely cruel. In Ordynskoye, "smeared" souls generally evoke hostility, fear and hatred, prone to hysteria and decorative spiritual breadth, like Sorokin. He loves structure and composure in a person, because this is the only way culture is created" (Anninsky, 1978).

This adaptation is still loved by many viewers:

"Perhaps the best film about the civil war. Precisely as an event of a planetary scale that influenced the fate of the world and Russia and rode like a tank through human destinies... In places, but do not consider it blasphemy, the film is even deeper than the novel by Alexei Tolstoy. ... With a strong desire, the film could be labeled as "White Guard". Denikin (Yuri Gorobets) is portrayed extremely nicely. Drozdovsky is scary, but logical in his own way. The fighters of the Volunteer Army were accurately discharged – someone walked like a martyr to fight for an idea, someone dreamed of "hanging all these" ... And the Reds are no better – fanatics Rublev (Nikolai Eremenko) and Sokolovsky, a prudent Chugai (Konstantin Grigoriev his the game clearly hints at Dybenko), careerist Belyakov (Nikolai Zasukhin)... Whites are fiercely cruel, shooting prisoners. No less cruel are the red ones, officers burning at the stake alive... And everything was filmed in the 1970s! Can they do that now? I strongly doubt it. There were no actors left, no directors. ... I would especially like to mention Irina Alferova and Svetlana Penkina. Having played the Bulavin sisters, the actresses did their best not even one hundred, but three hundred percent" (M. Kirillov).

"The film is just great, we recently watched it without stopping. We were going to watch one episode a day, but could not stand it. The female roles were played just fine. Yes! It's hard to surpass yourself. We couldn't play very well afterwards. However, these are many artists" (Vladimir N.).

"A wonderful screen adaptation, the film is not stretched at all. Is it possible to accommodate so many events and heroes in three episodes, to show a wide historical canvas, people of different classes? Still, Tolstoy wrote an epic novel. And if you leave one action, then, of course, the film will acquire dynamics, but would anyone want to watch it then? Without philosophical reflections on the fate of Russia, it would have turned out to be a trivial adventure film with beautiful young ladies and officers, a kind of American cinema. Penkina and Alferova played beautiful aristocrats, closed in their grief, and coped with their role. The actors in the film do not have to "act". Theatrical performance, with numerous emotions on the face and expressive gestures, was only at the dawn of cinema in musical comedies. The actors in the film are brilliantly selected. ... You can learn history from the film, it was filmed very interesting, without any pathos battle scenes" (Crete).

We Call the Fire on Ourselves. USSR, 1964. Directed by Sergei Kolosov. Screenwriters: Sergei Kolosov, Ovid Gorchakov, Janusz Pshimanovsky (based on the story of the same name by Ovid Gorchakov and Janusz Pshimanovsky). Actors: Lyudmila Kasatkina, Izolda Izvitskaya, Elena Koroleva, Alexander Lazarev, Stanislav Chekan, Rolan Bykov, Oleg Efremov and others. **TV premiere: 18 February 1965.**

Sergei Kolosov (1921–2012) directed two dozen films, many of which were a great success with viewers, especially the television ones "We Call Fire on Ourselves", "Operation "Trust".

The premiere of the military drama "We Call Fire on Ourselves", in which the main character, acting in the rear of the Wehrmacht, organizes a series of sabotage against the invaders, became a television sensation in 1965. It was the first Soviet TV series (which was then called a multi-part television feature film).

Film critic Victor Demin (1937–1993) wrote that "it is not difficult to discern in this work the failures of stylistic layers, a kind of pendulum swing between the pathos of journalism and the protocolly coldish fidelity to documents, between the "truth of the fact" and the requirements of the adventure genre, its canonical situations that bring up in us insight, which is quite often standard" (Demin, 1981: 104).

But the audience was completely carried away by the action-packed story of Anna Morozova in the talented performance of Lyudmila Kasatkina, empathizing and hating her enemies. Here I can agree with A. Muradov and K. Shergova: "The filmmakers not only invite us to consider the main character and her assistants not only as people – functions ready for a heroic deed, but also in the context of a person's moral and ethical choice, they also separate the image of an enemy from the image of a negative character. The film "We Call Fire on Ourselves" offers almost the entire

palette of images of German enemies, from cynical to stupidly enthusiastic and / or narcissistic military men doing their duty" (Muradov, Shergova, 2019: 24).

In the year of its premiere, this film by Sergei Kolosov "literally nailed the viewer to the screen for four nights. The authors did not adjust, did not adjust to the tastes of the audience. They saw in the viewer an intelligent, reflective interlocutor. And the viewer responded to the film with genuine love. ... The unforgettable Anya Morozova by Lyudmila Kasatkina is womanly wise and girlishly reckless, brave and weak. She was the type of Russian woman on whose shoulders the burden of war fell. ... Policeman Terekh by Rolan Bykov amazed the viewer with unprecedented multicolor and complexity. ... Thanks to this film, historical justice was restored, the heroes of the Bryansk underground were posthumously awarded orders. And the real Anna Morozova was posthumously awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union" (Malyukova, 2010: 238). And in 1965, "on the wave of the film's success, a special association "Telefilm" appeared, with Sergei Kolosov as its artistic director" (Ramm, 2010).

The audience success of the film "We Call Fire on Ourselves" was so great that four years later it was released on the screens of cinemas...

Modern viewers write with great respect about this film by S. Kolosov:

"The director very accurately managed to insert the newsreel into the film, to select the voice acting — the text for it... There are no special blunders in the film. I was especially pleased with the accuracy of creating the image of the enemy, the uniform of the Germans without blunders, even SS Obersturmführer Werner, and then in the correct field uniform, and not in the black uniform of the general SS, which has not been worn since 1939... The film makes you watch it again and again, it does not get boring... The acting is great" (Historian).

"Brilliant film! The first time I saw him was when "We Call Fire on Ourselves" was shown on television for the first time, that is, when he was a fourth-grader. Then, of course, I looked many times. In some places I could not hold back tears. I would like to draw your attention to the musical characteristics of the Germans. In the beginning and in the middle — these are popular songs with an accordion. And closer to the end — something completely different. Remember, a German sits at the piano in a doomed cafe and plays amazing music. The waitress, who has already laid the mine, brings him a glass of wine on a tray. He, not looking up from the keyboard, nods gratefully. The idea sounds that Germany is a country not only of martyrs, but also of great culture. A man studied music before the war, he studied professionally, because he plays not as an amateur, but as a virtuoso. But the homeland needed his talent, but only his fingers. After all, a sapper (and this military man is a sapper) must have sensitive, truly musical fingers: to mine and clear mines, to detonate. ... However, maybe a German is just from a cultural family with traditions of musical education. It's still sad, tragic" (Sergei).

We, the Undersigned. USSR, 1981. Directed by Tatiana Lioznova. Screenwriter Alexander Gelman (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Leonid Kuravlyov, Irina Muravyova, Aristarkh Livanov, Yuri Yakovlev, Klara Luchko, Oleg Yankovsky, Iosif Kobzon, Nikolai Parfyonov and others. **TV premiere: March 14, 1981.**

Tatiana Lioznova (1924–2011) delivered 9 films. Of which four (and this is not counting the legendary "Seventeen Moments of Spring") were among the most popular Soviet films.

Television film by Tatiana Lioznova "We, the Undersigned" also aroused considerable audience interest and attracted the attention of the film press.

For example, the theater critic Mikhail Shvydkoi wrote in the magazine "Cinema Art" asserted that in the film "We, the Undersigned" T. Lioznova, "who accurately sensed the comedian nationality of the central character, who paints with a special light all the eventual collisions of the play, in contrast to the theatre interpretation, did not change her interpretation in anything until the end of the movie. Realizing that, had she chosen a different stylistic move, the unconditionality of television cinematography would have exploded the logic of the conventional plot. ... Here a different, than in the theater, fusion of conditional and unconditional, truth and fiction was required. ... Having abandoned both the high comedy style, Moliere's or Griboyedov's, and the openly roguish comedy of an adventurous sense, Lioznova retained her everyday recognition in

everything. The action on the screen develops according to everyday, psychologically reliable laws, but all the signs of "low" comedy have been preserved. Therefore, the obvious is peaceful, without straining, always fraught with the possibility of the incredible. Hence – a kind of double dynamics of the tempo–rhythmic score of the film: the detailed slowness of the film story, sometimes even unnecessarily prolonging the footage, and the rapid explosions of actor's improvisations. Hence the "double focus" of visual solutions: the usual cinematic panning of a moving train and the landscape outside the window, and the expressiveness of gestures and facial expressions of performers close to theatrical. It is difficult for artists to play in this picture, although they are carefully selected and each is indisputably worthy of his role. They need to achieve comedic clarity in the unpretentious and seemingly non–pathetic manner chosen by the director and at the same time preserve the pathos of the author's thought. Lioznova managed, as it were, to dissolve the author's open temperament in the details of the characters' existence on the screen. In her film, it seems that the sharp turns of the plot are not specially felt: the theatrically calculated surprises, so spectacular on the stage, would look deliberately, awkward here. ... But in Lioznova's film, such a discrepancy gave birth to its own special dramatic comedy, hinting that adults do not play their games on the screen, and they do not know how to play them properly. ... T. Lioznova in her film returned the play by A. Gelman to its genre origins. The picture is free from that agitated, passionate didactics, directed directly to the audience, with which the best theatrical productions were saturated. On the screen, without any controversy, they played a story balancing on the verge of truth and fiction, similar to reality and frankly composed, in which the serious is revealed through the comic. The filmmakers did this quite deliberately: the memory of the genre worked for their plan, putting everything in its place. T. Lioznova knew that the author's pathos, the journalistic problematic nature of the material had to acquire a new quality in the world of comedy play. In a world very similar to real life, but still existing according to its own special laws – the laws of art" (Shvydkoi, 1982: 70–71, 74).

In post–Soviet times, the film critic Lydia Kuzmina emphasized that "the director for the first time put a picture in the center of which an acute social theme, for the first time spoke not "for", but "against", in this case against the vicious bureaucratic games of the socio–political system, the values of which are always were unshakable for her, being sensitive to the problems of our time. Tackling the difficult topic of social ill–being, obviously doubtful for the Soviet viewer, she was able to be convincing; the picture, which possesses all the advantages of a sharp screen psychological battle, evoked a lively emotional response" (Kuzmina, 2010: 266).

The responses of the audience of the XXI century prove that this picture of Tatyana Lioznova is still alive today, they argue about it, highly appreciating both the director's professionalism and the brilliant acting works of Leonid Kuravlev, Oleg Yankovsky, Irina Muravyova and other masters of the stage and screen:

"I really like this film. But for some reason I don't see anything funny there. What can be funny in human drama, betrayal, dishonesty, loyalty to the cause and to one's own principles? On the contrary, the film makes us seriously think about the present in our life, about the importance of honesty, sincerity, love, human relationships without falsehood, which are not bought or sold. And about many other things. The best masters of our cinema created the picture" (M. Morozova).

"Great movie! The film looks just a breeze! Although filmed, it would seem, on a production theme, it does not fit into a certain genre: there is melodrama, and satire, and psychological moments" (Shafranek).

"The film is wonderful – both as a director, as an actor, and so on. I love those – seemingly on a production topic, but to a greater extent social and psychological – deep" (Alina).

"I love this film very much! Recently I reviewed it with pleasure. What a good movie we had. ... Touches to the depths of the soul. You worry with the heroes, and at the end, like an emotional release, you laugh with them" (Hello).

"A very good movie. Of course, the stick is bent, but in principle – all problems were revealed correctly. And, unfortunately, that was not the point – just the stillborn Soviet system of management, invented by overseas theorists, began to be tested in Russia, as on a training ground – and in the 1980s, everyone understood its complete futility. ... The Soviet elite showed their inability to govern the country, in contrast, for example, from the Chinese – this is who we need to

learn from today – not from America, with its developed capitalism, and its correspondingly "developed" gigantic problems, but from China" (Romm)...

However, there are also viewers' opinions of a different kind, based on ideological criteria:

"Professionally, the film is great, and a separate prize can be given for the quality of the script. The only question for me is: what is the task of mass culture? To expose? To humiliate national dignity? To bring to the light of day all the squabbles and dirt? Make fun of them? If your answer to all this is "yes", then this film exactly matches your ideas about mass culture. After all, "We the Undersigned" preaches what? What are you, an ordinary average viewer, no one, a louse trembling against the omnipotent System, you cannot change anything, do not dare and do not even think to try! All the same, you will not succeed in a damn thing, but you will only find yourself in a fool in a pit, entangled in clown garlands, and you will laugh at yourself together with the same foolish bourgeois wife. I watch Soviet cinema a lot and carefully and I see how the level of pictures literally collapsed at the end of the 60s, how the high aspirations of the heroes were replaced by petty bourgeois problems, how the propaganda of alcoholism burst in and took root, how the artistic integrity of the scripts began to disappear. I correlate this degradation of cinematography with the well-known political and economic decisions of those years and see an unambiguous relationship. And it is as follows: as the leadership of the USSR intensified the restoration of capitalism, Soviet cinema becomes, on average, worse, and worse, and worse: it loses its originality, a positive charge, begins to glorify materialism, support selfishness, petty-bourgeois psychology, and then completely oppress without offering anything. "We the Undersigned" is a sample of the latter. "We the Undersigned" is lying. It lies in that it does not name the true causes of those phenomena, which with such relish demonstrates: nepotism, drunkenness, sycophancy, philistinism. It does not tell the truth that the cardinal cause of the catastrophe of the USSR is the resuscitation of the capitalist market; even more: it offers to expand this market (the same monologue of Shindin about housing in collective farms), and cleverly writes off all the problems on some bad people who are never in the frame, which makes them so intangible in the eyes of the viewer, and therefore invincible evil (by the way, a very clever manipulation of consciousness)"(T. Witte).

Who will Go to Truskavets? USSR, 1977. Directed by Valery Akhadow. Screenwriter Maksud Ibragimbekov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Alexander Kaidanovsky, Margarita Terekhova, Nikolay Grinko and others. **TV premiere: May 26, 1978.**

Valery Akhadow staged two dozen full-length films, but the most famous of them still remained the melodrama "Who will Go to Truskavets?", filmed by him at an early stage of his work.

Margarita Terekhova played here in a duet with Alexander Kaidanovsky (1946–1995). The story turned out to be ironic, intelligent, surprisingly free in atmosphere...

Literary critic and film critic Boris Runin (1912–1994) in the year of the release of this film on television, wrote about him like this: "We don't even know their names. Just a man and a woman. She is a completely independent, independent in her judgments, intelligent young woman. Self-confident, beautiful, accustomed to signs of attention from men. Even a little satiated with them, or rather, disappointed. Therefore, she is quite sober, rather skeptical about the claims of the hero. At the first meeting, she retained the ability to subtly analyze and sensibly evaluate every step of her partner in this world-old and forever new love game, not at all sacrificing her slightly sad femininity. And all the same, carried away! And she does not consider it necessary to hide it...

Where another representative of her gender could not have done without quite forgivable coquetry, she had to show an unexpected frankness and straightforwardness of character, as, it turns out, ardent, as well as alien to illusions. As for the male performer, he had to enter into emotional contact with the viewer no longer thanks to, but in spite of the properties of the hero's nature. ... After all, before he was firmly convinced that nature endowed him with the privileges of arbitrarily manipulating everyone in the world ... By what right? Well, of course, by right of high IQ. And in the name of what? Of course, in the name of personal success and every comfort. Both mental and domestic. ... The point here is that a suddenly surging feeling, as it turns out, can overshadow all the familiar values that the hero was so cheerfully proud of yesterday ... However,

in this case, it is also important that the hero and heroine are undoubtedly smart. His mocking irony and her soft insight make their duel of love a quick flash of thought. They are interested in each other. And that's why we are interested with them" (Runin, 1978: 7).

And already in the XXI century film critic Natalya Sirivlya believes that this "melodrama would be doomed to oblivion, if not for the unique acting duet of M. Terekhova and A. Kaidanovsky. Thanks to them, something incredible happens on the screen – a combination of pure femininity and ideal masculinity as a breakthrough of the intellectual, "Faustian" principle beyond the known. ... It is difficult to recall a domestic film, where the birth of love as a universal, cosmic, radically transforming power of a person was shown with greater convincingness and reliability" (Sirivlya, 2010: 47–48).

Admirers of the film "Who will Go to Truskavets?" today, probably even more than that of the "Day Train", which is understandable in principle – a love duet performed by actors of this class will always remain attractive:

"It is impossible to convey in words the feeling of tenderness and nostalgia that arises when watching this wonderful film. Even in his youth, accidentally seeing the credits with a meaningless, ordinary name, out of nothing to do, he began to look. And I saw a wonderful love story. Love of a man and a woman. The story is the most ordinary, but so quivering and tender... Many years have passed since then, Alexander Kaidanovsky is no longer with us, who for a long time became my idol after this film. Of course, he is a genius in "Stalker" and in other films I really liked him, but... In the film "Who will Go to Truskavets", in this magical, amazing tale of love – especially. And Margarita Terekhova, so tender, feminine, desired... The egoist with a cold heart fell in love. And before our eyes changes, suffering and loving. Isn't that a miracle? Yes, it's a miracle it is above and beyond everything else in the world. Love" (M. Lisichkin).

"Wonderful movie. You can watch, savor endlessly. But I don't think this is a film about love or about the "1970s generation." The hero of Kaidanovsky could live at any time in any country. He is a hero of any time. A person who does everything as he considers right or necessary for himself. Lives in coziness and comfort. Adapts his surroundings to himself. But I, too, would like to live. He himself chooses with whom to communicate, and with whom – not. He does not sacrifice anything, does not sacrifice any of his interests and amenities, communicating with a pretty woman or with his father or colleagues – well, he went to a concert, well, he took the flowers to the train, well, he sat with his father in the kitchen, well, he hit the resort Truskavets, well, stood out at work – they say, the most attentive and intelligent. What changes in it? He gets high on his correctness and, in general, freedom. Love does not penetrate into his heart. He remains a narcissistic egoist. All his actions are convenient and beneficial to him. But I don't want him to change. Who needs the honesty of a "broken mirror in the eye" that hurts others. His honesty is that he is who he is. And the heroine Terekhova easily "calculates" it. At the time of the final of the film, all the brightness of their relationship is already in the past" (Any).

Wizards. USSR, 1982. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on his own story "Monday starts on Saturday"). Actors: Alexandra Yakovleva, Alexander Abdulov, Valentin Gaft, Ekaterina Vasilieva, Valery Zolotukhin, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Mikhail Svetin, Roman Filippov, Semyon Farada, Leonid Kharitonov, Nikolai Parfyonov and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1982.**

Konstantin Bromberg (1939–2020) directed only four full-length feature films, two of which – "The Adventures of Electronics" and "The Wizards" – immediately fell in love with the multimillion TV audience.

Film critic Konstantin Ognev is convinced that the "Wizards" can be safely attributed to a vivid example of mass culture, although our art criticism deliberately bypassed this term in the Soviet period of history, considering it a product of Western society, carefully applying the concepts of "elite" and "spectator" cinema to cinema" (Ognev, 2018: 42).

The "Wizards" still have a lot of fans today:

"This film is on the New Year's gold list. It is fabulous and funny and still relevant, because films about love that overcomes evil and envy are always relevant" (Alla).

"An incomparable film. Gentle, kind, nagging and cheerful. Such a constellation of masters that takes your breath away ... For all times!" (Victoria).

"Probably, everyone in this life has something that is associated with childhood. So for me the film "Wizards" is that very association, the best, kind, bright fairy tale that brings at least a short while to my soul a feeling of complete happiness! While watching, my thoughts are transported to the most joyful moments of my life, and my mood rises by 100%! Excellent music... Actors are incomparable"(Lialechka).

"I really love the movie "Wizards". I always love especially for the New Year. ... Like many others, I associate the film with childhood" (V. Anchugov).

"To my shame, I saw this film for the first time just the other day. Here is a picture! What a game! Well done, well done all! We knew how, we knew how to shoot before so subtly, mentally, talented! This is not a modern fantasy "don't get what". And what is the subtext: just a film within a film. Either satire, but soft, or humor, but tough. The scenes with a self-assembled tablecloth, Gaft on a "horse", a cat who does not want to speak are just masterpieces, she laughed to tears" (O. Khramova).

But there are, of course, other points of view:

"I actively dislike the film. I love the Strugatskys very much and especially "Monday Starts on Saturday", and since the film was positioned "based on" this book, I naively expected even remote motives. Since there are so few of them that they are invisible, the film was immediately disliked. If I had expected it simply as a film "Wizards", then perhaps I would have treated it differently. But — alas! What is, it is" (Ines).

Interview on the release of the book "One Thousand and One Highest Grossing Soviet Movie: Opinions of Film Critics and Viewers" *

* An extended version of the interview of Oleg Sulkin, a film critic and correspondent of the Russian service of the Voice of America in New York, with Professor Alexander Fedorov.

Sulkin O. Leonid Gaidai named the absolute champion of the Soviet film distribution. *Voice of America*. 23.10.2020. <https://www.golosameriki.com/a/interview-with-alexander-fedorov-on-soviet-cinema/5633107.html>

Oleg Sulkin: Why did you decide to make this book? Do you have any predecessors in this topic?

Alexander Fedorov: Such a wide panorama of the opinions of Soviet and Russian film critics, film critics and viewers about a thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films is given in this book for the first time. This panorama, in my opinion, helps to think about such, for example, important questions: Why exactly such Soviet films became the leaders of the box office? Which Soviet directors can be considered the highest grossing and why? How did the press and viewers assess and rate the highest-grossing Soviet films?

Unfortunately, film distribution data are not available for all Soviet feature full-length films (and there were over seven thousand of them). There are, for example, serious gaps in the 1920s – 1930s.

I wrote this book for a long time – I collected and analyzed data from film statistics, articles and reviews of Soviet and Russian film critics, audience reviews on Internet portals, I tested individual parts of my text on the Yandex platform (often receiving good corrections and comments there), on portals “Kino-teater.ru”, “Kinopressa.ru” and Facebook. In particular, I would like to thank film critics Sergei Kudryavtsev and Igor Arkadiev for the constructive comments.

Of course, in film criticism, there were earlier attempts to analyze the most popular Soviet films, but these were, as a rule, the reflections of one film critic or film expert about the phenomenon of mass success in cinema (M. Turovskaya, N. Zorkaya, I. Levshina, V. Demin and etc.) or box-office Soviet films (S. Kudryavtsev, D. Gorelov, E. Nefedov, etc.). At the same time, as a rule, it was about a rather limited number of films that make up, conditionally, speaking, the first hundred in terms of film attendance. As far as I know, no attempts were made to make a large-scale comparison of film-critical and audience opinions about a thousand of the most popular Soviet films before the publication of my book.

Oleg Sulkin: How do you explain the phenomenal success of Leonid Gaidai's comedies?

Alexander Fedorov: The success of the best comedies by Leonid Gaidai, in my opinion, is due to a number of reasons. Here are those that lie on the surface: the popularity of the genre of comedy itself, the participation of famous actors (let's not forget that A. Demyanenko was a popular actor even before his first appearance in the legendary role of Shurik, Yuri Nikulin also had considerable popularity, Georgy Vitsin, Anatoly Papanov, Andrei Mironov, Sergei Filippov, Mikhail Pugovkin, Nonna Mordyukova, Leonid Kuravlev and many others), witty scripts saturated with dialogues and phrases that have gone "to the people", excellent directorial professionalism.

But, I think, there were other reasons that distinguished the comedies of Leonid Gaidai from hundreds of other Soviet comedies. First of all, it is a reliance on stable folklore archetypes of characters, successfully adapted to the Soviet realities of the 1960s – 1970s. The famous Gaidai's "trio" (Coward, Goonies, Experienced) grotesquely personified human types widespread among the people, in which millions of viewers could easily recognize, if not themselves, then their relatives and friends. L. Gaidai also had a successful remake of the traditions of silent sitcoms and masks of the 1920s.

There was also a bold satire. Well, for example, how do you like this plot twist: an influential communist boss sends a dissident to a psychiatric hospital so that he could not expose his criminal acts. Which Soviet filmmaker could afford such a plot twist? And in Leonid Gaidai's "Prisoner of

the Caucasus" this is almost the central episode of the film. And the fact that "The Diamond Hand" has become a kind of satirical encyclopedia of Soviet life was not written, probably, only by the lazy one.

The success of Leonid Gaidai is connected, of course, with the fact that he was able to find the key to the tastes of the most diverse layers of the audience. Someone was amused by tricks, chases, songs, funny remarks, etc. Someone enjoyed acting. Someone was attracted by the sex appeal of the young heroines of "Operation 'Y'" and the "Prisoner of the Caucasus". Someone happily "read" satirical injections. And someone enjoyed the parody layer of Gaidai's films, available to the so-called "watched" public. In other words, in the best comedies of Gaidai, schoolchildren with students, workers with peasants, and servicemen with officials, and the intelligentsia happily found their "cinema"...

Oleg Sulkin: You state that Boris Durov's fighter "Pirates of the XX century", which managed to gather 87.6 million viewers in the first year of the demonstration, has always remained the most popular Soviet film. How do you explain the success of this film, which many critics have branded as a second-rate genre product?

Alexander Fedorov: Here, probably, the answer will be simpler than about the reasons for the popularity of L. Gaidai's comedies. "Pirates of the XX Century" was released in Soviet theaters in July 1980, that is, back in the era of a total deficit for the action movie genre with a stake on oriental martial arts. Foreign films of this kind in the all-Union film distribution practically did not fall, and when sometimes this happened (Japanese "Judo Genius": rental in the USSR since 1967), they enjoyed overwhelming popularity. In addition, in 1980, the general audience did not yet have VCRs where they could contemplate Bruce Lee and Chuck Norris. The exoticism of the scene, the poignant plot, the popularity of Nikolai Eremenko were, of course, an important but secondary component for "Pirates of the XX century". If "Pirates of the XX century" were released in the Soviet release, say, in 1990–1991 (in the perestroika era of video salons and Western production flooding the screens), they probably would not have gathered even 20 million viewers...

Oleg Sulkin: The first, second and third places in terms of the number of millions of viewers in the first year of showing a particular film (or its first episode) in cinemas were shared by directors Leonid Gaidai, Eldar Ryazanov and Ivan Pyriev. What is your short comment on these top three?

Alexander Fedorov: I have already answered in detail above about the reasons for the success of Leonid Gaidai's comedies. The pictures of Eldar Ryazanov, with all their breadth of mass coverage, were mostly addressed to the intelligentsia of the audience and were often not sitcoms, but characters, therefore their popularity was less than Gaidai's. The highest-grossing film by Leonid Gaidai "The Diamond Arm" gathered 76.7 million viewers in the first year of screening, and the highest-grossing film by Eldar Ryazanov ("Office Romance")— 58.4 million. The difference, you see, is significant (and this despite the fact that the circulation of these comedies was high).

As for Ivan Pyryev, his films of both comedy and melodramatic-dramatic genres were consistently popular with a wide audience both in the 1930s – 1940s and in the 1950s – 1960s. He skillfully knew how to make "folk cinema". In the thaw and post-thaw times, he was scolded for "varnishing reality" in "Pig and Shepherd" and "Kuban Cossacks", but, in my opinion, these movies initially did not pretend to be the slightest semblance of realism, but were a kind of fairy tales with a bright folklore basis. And, I think, the audience of the 1940s – 1950s perceived them precisely as fairy tales about a rich and happy life, into which one could immerse themselves in front of the screen, even if temporarily distracted from the difficult reality.

Oleg Sulkin: What, in your opinion, attracted the viewer to such different, but beloved by the public, films like "Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears", "Amphibian Man" and "Gentlemen of Fortune"?

Alexander Fedorov: These are films of a different genre spectrum, so the reasons for their success have different dominants.

Consistently sustained in the genre of melodrama "Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears" was based on the fairy tale about Cinderella, but at the same time it successfully retained everyday verisimilitude, immersing the audience either in the atmosphere of retrostalgia associated with the thaw end of the 1950s, or in the recognizable realities of the turn of the 1980s (at the same time, without any pedaling of ideology). The main characters of "Moscow..." were typically close to the interests, feelings and aspirations of tens of millions of viewers. Far from the last reason for success was the gender line of this melodrama, connected with the fact that the three main characters are women with different destinies, intellectual level, trajectory of life success. I believe that the Oscar for the best foreign film "Moscow..." was awarded for the totality of all these components of success.

I have published a long article about the phenomenon of the "Amphibian Man" (<https://www.kino-teatr.ru/kino/art/kino/667/>), where I analyze in detail this highest-grossing Soviet science fiction film.

V. Propp, N. Zorkaya, M. Turovskaya, O. Nechai, M. Yampolsky and other researchers have convincingly proved that for the total success of works of mass culture, their creators must reckon on the folklore type of perception, and "the archetypes of fairy tales and legends, and the corresponding archetypes of folklore perception, when they meet, give the effect of the integral success of mass favorites" (Zorkaya, 1981 : 116).

Indeed, audience success is very closely related to the mythological layer of the work. "Strong" genres – thriller, fantasy, western – always rely on "strong" myths" (Yampolsky, 1987: 41). The interrelation of extraordinary, but "genuine" events – one of the fundamental archetypes (based on deep psychological structures affecting consciousness and subconsciousness) of fairy tales and legends – is very important for the mass popularity of films.

Researches of scientists (Eco, 1960; Zorkaya, 1981, 1994, etc.) show that the approaches of V. Propp to fairy tales are quite applicable to the analysis of many media texts, including almost all works of mass media culture (literary, cinematographic, television, etc.). Indeed, cultural mythology can be easily found in many popular films – in one way or another, echoes of myths and tales about Odysseus, Cyclops, Sirens, Aladdin, Cinderella, Little Red Riding Hood, Baba Yaga, Snake Gorynych, Bluebeard, etc. Of course, the audience (for example, school) may not notice this, but still unconsciously reach for fabulousness, fantastic action, mythological heroes... And in the massive success of the "Amphibian Man" this manifested itself extremely vividly...

The comedy "Gentlemen of Fortune" (where the talented directorial hand of Georgy Danelia, who remained "behind the scenes", but this is a separate story, as they say,) was very close in genre to the best works of Leonid Gaidai.

On the whole, many of the champion films owe their success among the mass audience to a complex of factors. These include: reliance on folklore and mythological sources, constancy of metaphors, orientation towards the consistent embodiment of the most persistent plot schemes, synthesis of the natural and the supernatural, appeal not to the rational, but to the emotional through identification (imaginary reincarnation into actively acting characters, merging with the atmosphere, aura of the work), The "magic power" of heroes, standardization (replication, unification, adaptation) of ideas, situations, characters, etc., mosaicism, seriality, compensation (the illusion of the realization of cherished, but not fulfilled desires), a happy ending, the use of such a rhythmic organization films, TV shows, etc., where the feeling of the audience, together with the content of the frames, is influenced by the order of their change; intuitive guessing of the subconscious interests of the public, etc.

Oleg Sulkin: You epigraph Pushkin's statement "They will say that criticism should be solely concerned with works that have visible merit, I don't think so. Another composition is insignificant in itself, but remarkable in its success and influence... ". Can you give one or two examples in film practice, confirming this idea of the classic?

Alexander Fedorov: There were quite a few such films in the USSR. It is clear, for example, that the artistic merits of the same "Pirates of the XX century" were incommensurable with their grandiose audience success. Other examples can be cited: "The Woman Who Sings" (54.9 million viewers), "No Returns" (43.6 million viewers), "Young" (39.1 million viewers), etc. For all that, this is a good material for studying the psychology of audience preferences, genre features of film success, "compensatory effects", etc.

Oleg Sulkin: Why, in your opinion, did "dramas and tragedies" become the leader in the table of genre ranks, and not "comedies" and "melodramas" that took second and third places, respectively?

Alexander Fedorov: At first glance, it seems surprising that a thousand of the most popular Soviet films are dominated not by comedy, melodrama or detective story, but by the dramatic genre (301 films out of a thousand). However, if we do not forget that films on the theme of the Civil War and Great Patriotic War were very popular among the mass audience throughout the years of the existence of the USSR, and in the 1930s–1960s, dramas on a revolutionary theme were also popular, then the situation becomes clearer.

So among the three hundred highest-grossing Soviet films of the dramatic genre, films on the theme of the Great Patriotic War – 71 (23.6%), the civil war – 21 (7%), revolution – 21 (7%), other wars – 19 (6.3%), armies on peace days – 12 (4.0%). In total, 47.9% of the most popular Soviet films of the dramatic genre are associated with the themes of wars, the army and the revolution that are in demand among a wide audience. Dramas, which take place in peacetime, are only 157 among the thousand highest-grossing Soviet films, which is less than the number of comedies (205) and melodramas (183).

Oleg Sulkin: It is known that in Soviet times, the distribution practice was widely used, when in reporting to a "necessary" film, for example, on a historical–revolutionary theme, viewers were added, taking them away from foreign entertainment films. Did you take this factor into account when calculating attendance?

Alexander Fedorov: Of course, I know about this practice, but, alas, it was impossible to use this factor in calculating the attendance, since no one has ever made public, for obvious reasons, what proportion of the distribution indicators Soviet film distributors "on the ground" added to the "necessary" in the ideological and political sense of films. Another thing is that "the necessary film production" in the USSR was often given an increased circulation. Circulation data for many Soviet films are available, but the tasks of my book did not include immersion in the subject of the peculiarities of the circulation practice of Soviet film production. Perhaps this will interest other researchers of the history of cinema.

Oleg Sulkin: Is there something that unites the highest-grossing Soviet directors?

Alexander Fedorov: I believe that the highest-grossing Soviet directors are primarily united by their reliance on the genre's staginess (plus professionalism). It is not for nothing that the top ten Soviet film champions include mainly comedic, brightly melodramatic and action-packed films ("Pirates of the 20th century", 87.6 million viewers; "Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears", 84.4 million, "The Diamond Hand", 76.7 million, "Prisoner of the Caucasus", 76.5 million, "Wedding in Malinovka", 74.6 million, "Crew", 71.1 million, "Operation 'Y' and other adventures of Shurik", 69.6 million, "Shield and Sword" (first episode), 68.3, "New Adventures of the Elusive", 66.2 million viewers) and only one film in the genre of war drama ("The Dawns Here Are Quiet...", 66.0 million viewers). For comparison: only one film by Andrei Tarkovsky and only two films by Andrei Konchalovsky got into the thousand of the highest-grossing Soviet films (and, of course, outside the first hundred leaders)...

Oleg Sulkin: Is there a fundamental difference in the position of film critics and the public?

Alexander Fedorov: To put it simply, a wide audience often completely surrenders to the screen spectacle, without trying to subject it to any deep analysis, while film critics do exactly this professionally, already while watching, they often try to analyze each component of the "film text" ... As for the typology of spectators perception and assessments of film works, then in my book a separate chapter is devoted to this, where I highlight the corresponding levels and characteristics.

Oleg Sulkin: Why do you call films media texts?

Alexander Fedorov: I understand the term "text" in a broad sense, and "film text" is a part of the media production, therefore, it can be called "media text" as well.

Oleg Sulkin: In the Soviet Union, and you write about this in your book, semi-official film critics treated the commercial success of Western blockbusters negatively as "the aggression of mass culture" and "ideological sabotage of the West" ... What was the influence of Western models on Soviet cinema?

Alexander Fedorov: The influence of Western cinematography was felt both in the Soviet mass film production, there and in the so-called "auteur cinema". If we talk about mass cinema, then, for example, the same "Pirates of the XX century" were clearly filmed according to the Western patterns of a spectacular action movie. In many of the Soviet "Eastern" stories set during the Civil War, it is easy to feel the influence of Western Westerns.

Oleg Sulkin: What period of Soviet cinema do you consider the most fruitful and why?

Alexander Fedorov: It depends in what sense. In artistic terms, this is most likely the thaw and post-thaw period of the 1960s with such, for example, masterpieces as "Andrei Rublev" and "July Rain"... During this period, many creators of Soviet films sincerely believed in the possibility of "socialism with a human face" (remember, "I am 20 years old" M. Khutsiev), paid great attention to the search for moral ideals, pictorial solutions. During this period, censorship (especially before the beginning of the Czechoslovak events of 1968) was still not as harsh as in the 1970s.

In terms of box office, the greatest take-off of Soviet cinema fell on the period from 1967 to 1980 (it was at this time that the most popular films appeared on Soviet screens), then for various reasons (there was both the enthusiasm of the masses with the political events of perestroika, and the sharply increased competition from TV, which became more spectacular in the second half of the 1980s, and the arrival of video, and the greater openness of Soviet distribution for foreign production, which also brought with it perestroika, and the deterioration of the economic situation, etc.) a gradual decline in cinema attendance began, which sharply increased in recent "Perestroika" years.

Oleg Sulkin: Today there is a gender revolution all over the world. Women are increasingly pushing men in the directing profession more and more confidently. In this context, how would you comment that the list of the thousand highest-grossing films of Soviet cinema included only 43 films (4.3%) directed by women, while the first 50 highest-grossing films of the USSR included films directed only by male directors?

Alexander Fedorov: Yes it is. The director's profession in the USSR was traditionally considered "hard" (including physically), so it was very difficult for women to break through an independent production. Of course, there were no official prohibitions, but the system itself was designed in such a way that already in the process of selecting applicants seeking to enter the

directing department (for example, VGIK), men were more often preferred... then they strove to become directors in those days.

Oleg Sulkin: Today Russian film critics are free in their analysis of Soviet cinema and can afford any assessment. You have studied the reviews of both the Soviet and post-Soviet times. Did you see a fundamental difference in the ratings? Can you state that the truth has finally triumphed?

Alexander Fedorov: Of course, in Soviet times, film criticism was clearly divided into semi-official, rigidly pursuing the "general line of the Communist Party" in their articles and film criticism "with a human face", trying to support talented works, often using the "Aesopian language". There were film critics who sincerely smashed, for example, "Amphibian Man" for "prettiness" and "bourgeois". There were film critics (N. Zorkaya, M. Turovskaya, and others) who tried to seriously approach the study of the phenomenon of "mass culture".

Russian film critics (especially young ones) can afford any swagger of tone and freedom of style, any assessments, including the most rude ones, without looking back at the opinions "from above". Well, it didn't fit for a newspaper, so you can publish anything on the Internet... Can it be stated today that the truth in film criticism has finally triumphed? I don't think so. The spectrum of opinions about the same films both in the USSR and in today's Russia is quite wide. And often even talented film critics do not agree on the assessments of both Soviet and Russian films.

Oleg Sulkin: What came as a surprise to you while working on the book and collecting statistical data?

Alexander Fedorov: The collection of statistical information was conducted by me for years and was largely based on the data given in the reference books by S. Kudryavtsev (1998), S. Zemlyanukhin and M. Segida (1996), but I was supplemented by rental data from the magazines "Cinema Art" and "Soviet Screen", dissertations, official documents, scientific monographs, etc. The greatest surprise of the collected film statistics for me was such a significant share of dramatic films in the thousand of the most popular Soviet films, since until now it was considered that entertainment genres dominated in the USSR. In general, this is true (especially at the top of the leaderboard film list), but what three hundred of the "thousand champion" films turned out to be a dramatic genre, which came as a surprise to me.

List of "100 most popular Soviet television films and TV series"

12 Chairs. USSR, 1976. Director and screenwriter Mark Zakharov (based on the novel of the same name by I. Ilf and E. Petrov). Actors: Andrey Mironov, Anatoly Papanov, Rolan Bykov, Georgy Vitsin, Nikolay Skorobogatov, Oleg Tabakov, Tatiana Peltzer, Lyubov Polishchuk, Natalia Zhuravleva, Lidia Fedoseeva–Shukshina, Vera Orlova, Mark Prudkin, Savely Bozh Kramarov, Boris Proskurin, Elena Shanina and others. **TV premiere: January 2, 1977.**

About Little Red Riding Hood. USSR, 1977. Directed by Leonid Nechaev. Screenwriter Inna Vetkina (based on the fairy tale "Little Red Riding Hood" by Charles Perrault). Actors: Yana Poplavskaya, Rina Zelenaya, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vladimir Basov, Nikolay Trofimov, Galina Volchek, Rolan Bykov, Stefania Stanyuta, Maria Barabanova, Maria Vinogradova, Yuri Belov, Dmitry Iosifov and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1977.**

Adjutant of His Excellency. USSR, 1969. Directed by Evgeny Tashkov. Screenwriters Igor Bolgarin, Georgy Seversky. Actors: Yuri Solomin, Alexander Milokosty, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Vladimir Kozel, Tatiana Ivanitskaya, Evgeny Shutov, Nikolai Timofeev, Andrey Petrov, Victor Pavlov, Evgeny Tashkov, Yuri Nazarov, Valentin Grachev, Evgeny Teterin, Larisa Danilina, Nikolai Karbbe, Gennady Valois, Oleg Golubitsky, Valentin Smirnitsky, Igor Starygin, Nikolai Gritsenko, Sofya Pavlova, Anatoly Papanov, Mikhail Kokshenov, Lyudmila Chursina and others. **TV premiere: April 1970.**

Adventures of Buratino. USSR, 1975. Directed by Leonid Nechaev. Screenwriter Inna Vetkina (based on the tale of Alexei Tolstoy). Actors: Dmitry Iosifov, Tatiana Protsenko, Roma Stolkarts, Tomas Augustinas, Grigory Svetlorusov, Nikolai Grinko, Vladimir Etush, Vladimir Basov, Elena Sanaeva, Rolan Bykov, Rina Zelenaya and others. **Premiere on TV: January 1, 1976.**

Adventures of Electronic. USSR, 1979. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriter Evgeny Veltistov (based on his own book). Actors: Yuri Torsuev, Vladimir Torsuev, Vasily Modest, Oksana Alekseeva, Maxim Kalinin, Dmitry Maksimov, Evgeny Livshits, Valeria Soluyan, Nikolay Grinko, Elizaveta Nikishchikhina, Vladimir Basov, Nikolai Karachentsov, Evgeny Vesnik, Maya Bulgakova, Nikolai Makoyarsky, Roza Yuri Chernov, Lev Perfilov and others. **TV premiere: May 2, 1980.**

Adventures of Petrov and Vasechkin, Ordinary and Incredible. USSR, 1983. Directed by Vladimir Alenikov. Scriptwriters Vladimir Alenikov, Valentin Gorlov. Actors: Dmitry Barkov, Yegor Druzhinin, Inga Ilm, Alyosha Gusev, Maxim Polyansky, Sveta Protasenkova, Andrei Kanevsky, Yuri Medvedev, Inna Alenikova, Lyudmila Ivanova, Tatiana Bozhok, Alexander Lenkov, Anatoly Kuznetsov and others. **TV premiere: June 1, 1984.**

Adventures of Prince Florizel. USSR, 1979. Directed by Evgeny Tatarsky. Scriptwriter Edgar Dubrovsky (based on the series of stories "The Suicide Club" and "Rajah's Diamond" by R.L. Stevenson). Actors: Oleg Dal, Donatas Banionis, Igor Dmitriev, Lyubov Polishchuk, Elena Solovey, Boris Novikov, Vladimir Shevelkov, Mikhail Pugovkin, Vladimir Basov, Evgeny Kindinov, Elena Tsyplakova and others. **TV premiere: January 12, 1981.**

Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn. USSR, 1981. Director and screenwriter Stanislav Govorukhin (based on the novel by Mark Twain). Actors: Fyodor Stukov, Vladislav Galkin, Maria Mironova, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Valentina Shendrikova, Behaylu Mengesha, Vladimir Konkin, Valery Rubinchik, Vsevolod Abdulov, Rolan Bykov, Victor Pavlov, Talgat Nigmatulin, Fedor Odinokov, Boris Zaydenberg, Lev Perfilov and others. **Premiere on TV: March 27, 1982.**

Ah, Vaudeville, Vaudeville. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Georgy Yungvald – Khilkevich (based on P. Grigoriev's vaudeville "The Daughter of a Russian Actor"). Actors: Galina Belyaeva, Mikhail Pugovkin, Oleg Tabakov, Lyudmila Krylova and others. **Premiere on TV January 6, 1980.**

All the King's Men. USSR, 1971. Directed by Alexander Gutkovich, Naum Ardashnikov. Screenwriter Alexander Gutkovich (based on the novel by Robert P. Warren). Actors: Georgy Zhzhonov, Mikhail Kozakov, Tatiana Lavrova, Boris Ivanov, Alla Demidova, Oleg Efremov, Alexandra Klimova, Anatoly Papanov, Rostislav Plyatt, Valentina Kalinina, Valery Khlevinsky, Lev Durov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Ada Voytsik, Laimonas Noreika and others. **Premiere on TV: 28 August 1971.**

American Tragedy. USSR, 1981. Directed by Marionas Giedris. Screenwriter Pranas Morkus (based on the novel of the same name by Theodor Dreiser). Actors: Gediminas Storpirtshtis, Anna Aleksakhina, Aida Zara, Regimantas Adomaitis and others. **TV premiere: October 1981.**

And It's All about Him. USSR, 1978. Directed by Igor Shatrov. Screenwriter Vil Lipatov (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Evgeny Leonov, Igor Kostolevsky, Leonid Markov, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Larisa Udovichenko, Vladimir Nosik, Alexey Pankin, Victor Proskurin, Alexander Kavalerov, Lyubov Polekhina, Lyudmila Chursina, Nikolai Parfyonov, Albert Filozov, Yuri Kayurov, Boris Gusina and others. **Premiere on TV: March 24, 1978.**

Bat. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Jan Fried (based on the libretto by Nikolai Erdman and Mikhail Volpin and the operetta of the same name Johann Strauss). Actors: Yuri Solomin, Lyudmila Maksakova, Larisa Udovichenko, Vitaly Solomin, Oleg Vidov, Igor Dmitriev, Yuri Vasiliev, Evgeny Vesnik, Glikeria Bogdanova-Chesnokova, Olga Volkova, Sergei Filippov, Ivan Lyubeznov, Alexander Demyanenko and others. **TV premiere on March 4 1979.**

Battalions are Asking for Fire. USSR, 1985. Alexander Bogolyubov, Vladimir Chebotarev. Screenwriters Yuri Bondarev, Alexander Bogolyubov (based on the story of the same name by Yuri Bondarev). Actors: Alexander Zbruev, Vadim Spiridonov, Oleg Efremov, Alexander Galibin, Elena Popova, Igor Sklyar, Vladimir Kashpur, Nikolay Karachentsov, Vyacheslav Baranov, Borislav Brondukov, Alexander Feklistov, Vadim Andreev and others. **TV premiere – February 1985.**

Big Break. USSR, 1973. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Scriptwriters Alexey Korenev, Georgy Sadovnikov (based on G. Sadovnikov's story "I go to the people"). Actors: Mikhail Kononov, Evgeny Leonov, Rolan Bykov, Alexander Zbruev, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Yuri Kuzmenkov, Savely Kramarov, Natalia Bogunova, Natalia Gvozdikova, Victor Proskurin, Valery Nosik, Nina Maslova, Irina Azer, Lyudmila Kasatkina and others. **Premiere on TV: April 29, 1973.**

Bonivour's Heart. USSR, 1969. Directed by Mark Orlov. Screenwriter Andrei Shemshurin (based on the novel of the same name by Dmitry Nagishkin). Actors: Lev Prygunov, Boris Chirkov, Tamara Korolyuk, Ivan Pereverzev, Victor Korshunov, Pyotr Glebov, Maya Bulgakov and others. **TV premiere: October 21, 1969.**

Born by the Revolution. USSR, 1974–1977. Directed by Grigory Kokhan. Screenwriters Geliy Ryabov, Alexey Nagorny. Actors: Evgeny Zharikov, Natalia Gvozdikova, Victor Shulgin, Vadim Medvedev, Uldis Pucitis, Lev Prygunov, Alexander Yanvaryov, Vladimir Talashko, Ernst Romanov, Alexander Khochinsky, Evgeny Leonov–Gladyshev, Alexander Filippenko, Alexander Belyavsky and others. **TV premiere (first series): November 10, 1974.**

Bumbarash. USSR, 1971. Directed by Nikolai Rasheev, Abram (Arkady) Naroditsky. Screenwriter Evgeny Mitko (based on the early works of Arkady Gaidar). Actors: Valery Zolotukhin, Yuri Smirnov, Natalia Dmitrieva, Alexander Khochinsky, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Lev Durov, Roman Tkachuk and others. **TV premiere: May 1, 1972.**

Captain Nemo. USSR, 1975. Directed by Vasily Levin. Screenwriters Vasily Levin, Edgar Smirnov (based on the novels by Jules Verne "20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" and "The Steam House"). Actors: Vladislav Dvorzhetsky, Yuri Rodionov, Mikhail Kononov, Vladimir Talashko, Marianna Vertinskaya, Vladimir Basov, Gennady Nilov, Alexander Porokhovshchikov and others. **TV premiere: March 29, 1976.**

Circus Princess. USSR, 1982. Director and screenwriter Svetlana Druzhinina (based on the operetta of the same name by Imre Kalman). Actors: Natalia Belokhovstikova, Igor Keblushek, Nikolay Trofimov, Yuri Moroz, Elena Shanina, Lyudmila Kasatkina, Vladimir Basov, Alexander Shirvindt, Emmanuel Geller and others. **TV premiere: December 25, 1982.**

Collapse of Engineer Garin. USSR, 1973. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Scriptwriter Sergei Potepalov (based on the novel by A. Tolstoy "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin"). Actors: Oleg Borisov, Nonna Terentyeva, Alexander Belyavsky, Vasily Korzun, Gennady Saifulin, Mikhail Volkov, Vladimir Tatosov, Efim Kopelyan, Grigory Gai, Ernst Romanov, Vitaly Yushkov, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Algimantas Masulis, Valentin Premier Nikulin and others. **TV Premiere: October 15, 1973.**

Confrontation. USSR, 1985. Directed by Semyon Aranovich. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Oleg Basilashvili, Andrei Boltnev,

Yuri Kuznetsov, Murman Dzhinoria, Victor Gogolev, Alexander Kazakov, Elizaveta Nikishchina, Stanislav Sadalsky, Talgat Nigmatulin, Sergei Bekhterev and others. **TV premiere: November 10, 1985.**

Dangerous Turn. USSR, 1972. Director and screenwriter Vladimir Basov (based on the play of the same name by J. Priestley). Actors: Yuri Yakovlev, Valentina Titova, Alexander Dick, Elena Valaeva, Antonina Shuranova, Vladimir Basov, Rufina Nifontova and others. **TV premiere: December 16, 1972.**

D'Artagnan and the Three Musketeers. USSR, 1979. Directed by Georgy Yungvald-Khilkevich. Scriptwriter Mark Rozovsky (based on the novel "The Three Musketeers" by Alexander Dumas). Actors: Mikhail Boyarsky, Veniamin Smekhov, Valentin Smirnitsky, Igor Starygin, Oleg Tabakov, Alisa Freindlikh, Alexander Trofimov, Margarita Terekhova, Alexei Kuznetsov, Lev Durov, Irina Alferova, Leonid Kanevsky, Boris Klyuev, Vladimir Balon and others. **Premiere on TV: December 25, 1979.**

Day Train. USSR, 1976. Directed by Inessa Selezneva. Screenwriter Boris Zolotarev. Actors: Margarita Terekhova, Valentin Gaft, Rimma Bykova, Tatiana Lavrova, Alla Meshcheryakova, Svetlana Nemolyaeva, Victor Bortsov, Alla Pokrovskaya, Tatiana Bestaeva and others. **TV premiere: September 2, 1976.**

Dead Souls. USSR, 1984. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Schweitzer (based on the work of the same name by Nikolai Gogol). Actors: Alexander Trofimov, Alexander Kalyagin, Yuri Bogatyryov, Larisa Udovichenko, Tamara Nosova, Vitaly Shapovalov, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Vyacheslav Nevinny, Vsevolod Sanaev, Alexey Safonov, Inna Makarova, Valery Zolotukhin, Yuri Volyntsev, Igor Kash Lidia Fedoseeva-Shukshina, Inna Churikova, Elizaveta Nikishchina and others. **TV premiere: November 19, 1984.**

Dirk. USSR, 1973. Directed by Nikolai Kalinin. Screenwriter Anatoly Rybakov (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Sergei Shevkunenko, Vladimir Dichkovsky, Igor Shulzhenko, Mikhail Golubovich, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Zoya Fedorova, Leonid Kmit, Natalia Chemodurova, Victor Sergachev, Rostislav Yankovsky and others. **TV premiere on June 4, 1974.**

Dog in the Manger. USSR, 1977. Director and screenwriter Jan Fried (based on the play of the same name by Lope de Vega). Actors: Mikhail Boyarsky, Margarita Terekhova, Elena Proklova, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Igor Dmitriev, Nikolai Karachentsov, Ernst Romanov, Zinaida Sharko, Victor Ilyichev, Fedor Nikitin and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1978.**

Dog's Heart. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vladimir Bortko. Screenwriter Natalia Bortko (based on the story of the same name by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Evgeny Evstigneev, Boris Plotnikov, Vladimir Tolokonnikov, Nina Ruslanova, Olga Melikhova, Alexey Mironov, Roman Kartsev, Angelica Nevolina and others. **TV premiere: November 20, 1988.**

Duenna. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Grigoriev (based on the play by Richard B. Sheridan). Actors: Tatiana Vasilyeva, Irina Muravyova, Alexander Korol, Marina Livanova, Alexander Safronov, Evgeny Leonov, Vladimir Zeldin, Lyubov Polishchuk, Vladimir Soshalsky, Semyon Farada and others. **TV premiere on July 27, 1979.**

Eldest Son. USSR, 1975. Director and screenwriter Vitaly Melnikov (based on the play of the same name by Alexander Vampilov). Actors: Evgeny Leonov, Nikolay Karachentsov, Mikhail Boyarsky, Natalia Egorova, Vladimir Izotov, Svetlana Kryuchkova and others. **TV premiere: May 20, 1976.**

Eternal Call. USSR, 1973–1983. Directed by Vladimir Krasnopolsky, Valery Uskov. Screenwriters Anatoly Ivanov, Konstantin Isaev (based on the novel of the same name by Anatoly Ivanov). Actors: Valery Khlevinsky, Vadim Spiridonov, Nikolai Ivanov, Pyotr Velyaminov, Ivan Lapikov, Vladlen Biryukov, Ada Rogovtseva, Tamara Semina, Andrei Martynov, Vladimir Borisov, Efim Kopelyan and others. **TV premieres: June 2, 1976 (part 1), 16 January 1979 (part 2), May 11, 1983 (part 3).**

Fathers and Sons. USSR, 1983. Directed by Vyacheslav Nikiforov. Screenwriters Evgeny Grigoriev, Oscar Nikich (based on the novel of the same name by I. Turgenev). Actors: Vladimir Bogin, Vladimir Konkin, Natalia Danilova, Alexey Kuznetsov, Tatiana Dogileva, Boris Khimichev, Eduard Izotov, Muza Krepkogorskaya, Vladimir Samoilov, Svetlana Ryabova and others. **TV premiere: July 10, 1984.**

For Family Circumstances. USSR, 1977. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Screenwriter Valentin Azernikov (based on his own play). Actors: Galina Polskikh, Marina Dyuzheva, Evgeny Steblov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Evgenia Khanaeva, Nikolai Parfyonov, Vladimir Basov, Rolan Bykov, Anatoly Papanov, Nina Doroshina, Lyudmila Zaitseva, Nina Agapova, Lev Durov and others. **Premiere on TV: April 29, 1978.**

Formula of Love. USSR, 1984. Directed by Mark Zakharov. Screenwriter Grigory Gorin (based on "Count Cagliostro" by A. Tolstoy). Actors: Nodar Mgaloblishvili, Elena Valyushkina, Alexander Mikhailov, Alexander Abdulov, Semyon Farada, Elena Aminova, Tatiana Peltzer, Leonid Bronevoy, Alexandra Zakharova, Nikolai Skorobogatov, Anna Andriyanova and others. **Premiere on TV: December 30, 1984.**

Gadfly. USSR, 1980. Directed by Nikolai Mashchenko. Screenwriters Julius Dunskey, Valery Frid (based on the novel by Ethel Lilian Voynich). Actors: Andrei Kharitonov, Anastasia Vertinskaya, Sergei Bondarchuk, Ada Rogovtseva, Konstantin Stepankov, Konstantin Tsanev, Grigore Grigoriu, Irina Skobtseva and others. **TV premiere: November 3, 1980.**

Gloomy River. USSR, 1969. Directed by Yaropolk Lapshin. Screenwriters Yaropolk Lapshin, Valentin Selivanov (based on the novel of the same name by Vyacheslav Shishkov). Actors: Georgy Epifantsev, Victor Chekmarev, Lyudmila Chursina, Valentina Vladimirova, Givi Tokhadze, Alexander Demyanenko, Afanasy Kochetkov, Valentina Telegina, Evgeny Vesnik, Ivan Ryzhov, Daniil Netrebin, Yuri Medvedev and others. **TV premiere: April 15, 1969.**

Golden Mine. USSR, 1977. Directed by Evgeny Tatarsky. Screenwriters Pavel Grakhov, Artur Makarov. Actors: Mikhail Gluzsky, Evgeny Kindinov, Oleg Dal, Larisa Udovichenko, Igor Efimov, Igor Dobryakov, Oleg Efremov, Igor Yankovsky, Zhanna Prokhorenko, Lyubov Polishchuk, Elena Fomchenko, Lev Lemke, Tatiana Tkach, Igor Dmitriev and others. **TV premiere: November 10, 1977 (Leningrad TV), June 14, 1978 (Central TV).**

Green Van. USSR, 1983. Directed by Alexander Pavlovsky. Screenwriter Igor Shevtsov (based on the story of the same name by Alexander Kozachinsky). Actors: Dmitry Kharatyan, Alexander Demyanenko, Borislav Brondukov, Alexander Solovyov, Regimantas Adomaitis, Konstantin Grigoriev, Eduard Martsevich, Victor Ilyichev, Ekaterina Durova and others. **TV premiere: December 28, 1983.**

Guest from the Future. USSR, 1984. Directed by Pavel Arsenov. Scriptwriters Pavel Arsenov, Kir Bulychev (based on the science fiction novel by Kir Bulychev "One Hundred Years Ahead"). Actors: Natalya Guseva, Alexey Fomkin, Ilya Naumov, Vyacheslav Nevinny, Mikhail Kononov, Maryana Ionesyan, Elena Metelkina, Evgeny Gerasimov, Vladimir Nosik, Igor Yasulovich, Georgy Burkov, Valentina Talyzina, Natalya Varley, Andrey Gradov, Elena Tsyplakova and others. **Premiere on TV: March 25, 1985.**

Gypsy. USSR, 1979. Directed by Alexander Blank. Screenwriters: Alexander Blank, Natalya Kalinina, Radiy Kushnerovich, Anatoly Kalinin (based on the novel of the same name by Anatoly Kalinin). Actors: Clara Luchko, Mikhail Volontir, Alexey Nikulnikov, Olga Zhulina, Nina Ruslanova, Maya Bulgakova, Matlyuba Alimova, Leonid Nevedomsky, Vladimir Zamansky and others. **TV premiere: August 18, 1980.**

Heavenly Swallows. USSR, 1976. Director and screenwriter Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the operetta of the composer Florimont Herve "Mademoiselle Nitouche", libretto: A. Meljak, A. Millau). Actors: Andrey Mironov, Iya Ninidze, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Sergey Zakharov, Alexander Shirvindt and others. **TV premiere: December 19, 1976.**

Hello, I'm Your Aunt. USSR, 1975. Director and screenwriter Victor Titov (based on the play by Brandon Thomas "Charley's Aunt"). Actors: Alexander Kalyagin, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Mikhail Kozakov, Oleg Shklovsky, Mikhail Lyubeznov, Tamara Nosova, Tatyana Vedeneeva, Tatyana Vasilyeva, Galina Orlova, Valentin Gaft and others. **TV premiere: December 26, 1975.**

How the Steel Was Tempered. USSR, 1973. Directed by Nikolai Mashchenko. Screenwriters Alexander Alov, Vladimir Naumov (based on the novel of the same name by Nikolai Ostrovsky). Actors: Vladimir Konkin, Konstantin Stepankov, Fyodor Panasenkov, Natalya Sayko, Antonina Leftiy, Antonina Maksimova, Mikhail Golubovich, Lyudmila Efimenko, Sergei Ivanov, Vladimir Talashko, Les Serdyuk, Sergei Polezhaev, Elza Radzin and others. **TV premiere: November 3, 1973.**

In Search of Captain Grant. USSR–Bulgaria, 1985. Director and screenwriter Stanislav Govorukhin (based on the novel by J. Verne "Children of Captain Grant"). Actors: Vladimir Smirnov, Nikolay Eremenko, Lembit Ulfsak, Tamara Akulova, Vladimir Gostyukhin, Boris Khmelnitsky, Marina Vlady and others. **TV premiere: May 1986.**

Investigation is Conducted by Experts. USSR, 1971–1989. Directed by Vyacheslav Brovkin, Yuri Krotenko, Victor Turbin, Gennady Pavlov. Screenwriters Alexander Lavrov, Olga Lavrova. Actors: Georgy Martynyuk, Leonid Kanevsky, Elza Lezhdey and others.

Irony of Fate or Enjoy Your Bath! USSR, 1975. Directed by Eldar Ryazanov. Screenwriters: Emil Braginsky and Eldar Ryazanov. Actors: Andrey Myagkov, Barabara Brylska, Yuri Yakovlev and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1976.**

Jack Vosmyorkin is an "American". USSR, 1986. Directed by Evgeny Tatarsky. Screenwriters: Arkady Tigai, Anatoly Kozak, Evgeny Tatarsky (based on the story of the same name by Nikolai Smirnov). Actors: Alexander Kuznetsov, Lyubov Malinovskaya, Irina Rakshina, Lev Durov, Mikhail Vaskov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Nadezhda Smirnova, Alexander Galibin and others. **TV premiere: May 14, 1988 (three months earlier, it was screened in an abridged version).**

June 31st. USSR, 1978. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Screenwriters Nina Fomina, Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the story by John B. Priestley). Actors: Natalia Trubnikova, Nikolay Eremenko, Vladimir Zeldin, Vladimir Etush, Lyudmila Vlasova, Alexander Godunov, Lyubov Polishchuk, Igor Yasulovich, Emmanuel Geller, Mikhail Kokshenov, Vladimir Soshalsky and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1978.**

Laterna Magica. USSR, 1976. Directed by Evgeny Ginzburg. Screenwriter Boris Purgalin. Actors: Lyudmila Gurchenko, Spartak Mishulin, Nikolai Karachentsov, Yuri Volyntsev, Yevgeny Morgunov, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Gennady Khazanov, Valentin Nikulin, Lyubov Polishchuk, Natalya Selezneva, Vakhtang Kikabidze and others. **Premiere on TV: January 1977.**

Life of Klim Samgin. USSR, 1988. Directed by Victor Titov. Screenwriters Alexander Lapshin, Victor Titov (based on the novel of the same name by Maxim Gorky). Actors: Andrey Rudensky, Lenya Gorelik, Elena Solovey, Ernst Romanov, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Sergey Bekhterev, Sergey Makovetsky, Andrey Kharitonov, Sergey Koltakov, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Gluzsky, Natalia Egorova, Natalia Gundareva, Alexey Zharkov, Irina Mazurkevich Evgenia Glushenko, Svetlana Smirnova, Alexander Galibin, Alexander Kalyagin, Andrey Boltnev, Victor Proskurin, Valentin Gaft, Vladimir Soshalsky, Vsevolod Shilovsky, Alexey Loktev, Igor Vladimirov, Natalia Danilova, Irina Rozanova and others. **TV premiere: March 28, 1988.**

Long Road in the Dunes. USSR, 1981. Directed by Aloizs Brenčs. Screenwriters Dmitry Vasiliu, Oleg Rudnev. Actors: Lilita Ozolia, Juozas Kiselyus, Romualdas Ramanauskas, Eduards Pavuls, Karlis Trencis, Arijis Geykins, Lydia Freimane, Aare Laanemets, Indra Burkovska, Dzidra Ritenberga, Evgeniy Zharikov, Lyudmila Paula Talvik. **TV premiere: June 2, 1982.**

Major "Whirlwind". USSR, 1967. Directed by Evgeny Tashkov. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Vadim Beroev, Anastasia Voznesenskaya, Victor Pavlov, Evgeny Teterin, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Vladimir Kenigson, Alexander Shirvindt, Igor Yasulovich, Vladimir Osenev, Yuri Volyntsev and others. **TV premiere: November 8, 1967. In the film distribution – July 8, 1968.**

Mary Poppins, Goodbye. USSR, 1983. Directed by Leonid Kvinikhidze. Scriptwriter Vladimir Valutsky (based on the story by Pamela Travers). Composer Maxim Dunaevsky. Actors: Natalia Andreichenko, Anna Plisetskaya, Philip Rukavishnikov, Larisa Udovichenko, Albert Filozov, Lembit Ulfsak, Oleg Tabakov, Zinovy Gerdt, Leonid Kanevsky, Ilya Rutberg, Irina Skobtseva and others. **TV premiere: January 8, 1984.**

Meeting Place Can Not Be Changed. USSR, 1979. Directed by Stanislav Govorukhin. Screenwriters Arkady and Georgy Vayner (based on his own novel "The Era of Mercy"). Actors: Vladimir Vysotsky, Vladimir Konkin, Sergei Yursky, Alexander Belyavsky, Victor Pavlov, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Zinovy Gerdt, Natalia Fateeva, Leonid Kuravlyov, Svetlana Svetlichnaya, Evgeny Evstigneev, Ekaterina Gradova, Valeria Zaklunnaya, Larisa Udovichenko, Evgeny Shilunnaya, Alexander Milyutin, Andrey Gradov, Natalia Danilova, Alexey Mironov, Vsevolod Abdulov, Evgeny Leonov—Gladyshev, Ivan Bortnik, Stanislav Sadalsky, Vladlen Paulus, Vladimir Zharikov, Yunona

Kareva, Nikolay Slesarev, Tatiana Tkach, Alexander Abdulov, Natalia Premier Krachkovskaya and others. **Premier on TV: November 11, 1979.**

Midshipmen, Go Ahead! USSR, 1987. Directed by Svetlana Druzhinina. Screenwriters Svetlana Druzhinina, Yuri Nagibin, Nina Sorotokina (based on the novel by Nina Sorotokina "Three from the Navigation School"). Actors: Sergei Zhigunov, Dmitry Kharatyan, Vladimir Shevelkov, Tatyana Lyutaeva, Olga Mashnaya, Mikhail Boyarsky, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Alexander Abdulov, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Victor Pavlov, Valery Afanasyev, Vladimir Balon, Victor Bortsov, Alexander Pashutin, Nelly Paul Butkevich, Semyon Farada, Boris Khimichev, Rimma Markova, Igor Yasulovich, Elena Tsyplakova, Lyudmila Nilskaya, Vladimir Steklov and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1988.**

Mikhailo Lomonosov. USSR, 1986. Directed by Alexander Proshkin. Screenwriters Oleg Osetinsky, Leonid Nekhoroshev. Actors: Alexander Mikhailov, Igor Volkov, Victor Stepanov, Anatoly Vasiliev, Lyudmila Polyakova, Sos Sargsyan, Natalia Sayko, Andrey Boltnev, Kirill Kozakov, Gennady Yukhtin, Alexey Zharkov, Oleg Menshikov, Yuri Yarvet, Alexander Sirin, Nikolai Prokopzhevich, Ilze Liepa, Victor Sergachev, Alexander Domogarov, Boris Plotnikov, Leonid Yarmolnik, Aristarkh Livanov, Marina Yakovleva and others. **TV premiere: November 11, 1986.**

Nameless Star. USSR, 1978. Directed by Mikhail Kozakov. Screenwriter Alexander Khmelik (based on the play of the same name by M. Sebastian). Actors: Anastasia Vertinskaya, Igor Kostolevsky, Mikhail Kozakov, Grigory Lampe, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Mikhail Svetin and others. **TV premiere: February 17, 1979.**

Nikolay Vavilov. USSR–West Germany, 1990. Directed by Alexander Proshkin. Screenwriters: Sergey Dyachenko, Yuri Arabov, Alexander Proshkin. Actors: Kostas Smoriginas, Andrei Martynov, Irina Kupchenko, Bogdan Stupka, Sergei Gazarov, Georgy Kavtaradze, Tamara Degtyareva, Sergei Plotnikov, Nikolai Lavrov, Ingeborga Dapkunaite, Nina Usatova, Elizaveta Nikishchikina and others. **TV premiere: January 7, 1991.**

Noble Robber Vladimir Dubrovsky. USSR, 1988. Directed by Vyacheslav Nikiforov. Scenarists Evgeny Grigoriev, Oscar Nikich (based on the story by A.S. Pushkin). Actors: Mikhail Efremov, Marina Zudina, Vladimir Samoilov, Kirill Lavrov, Anatoly Romashin, Victor Pavlov, Vladimir Konkin, Andrey Smolyakov and others. **TV premiere on January 16, 1990.**

Old New Year. USSR, 1980. Directed by Oleg Efremov, Naum Ardashnikov. Screenwriter Mikhail Roshchin (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Vyacheslav Nevinny, Alexander Kalyagin, Ksenia Minina, Irina Miroshnichenko, Anastasia Nemolyaeva, Pyotr Shcherbakov, Georgy Burkov, Vladimir Troshin, Boris Shcherbakov, Evgenia Khanaeva, Natalya Nazarova, Evgeny Evstigneev and others. **Premiere on TV: January 1, 1981.**

Open Book. USSR, 1977–1979. Directed by Victor Titov. Screenwriters Veniamin Kaverin, Vladimir Savin (based on the novel of the same name by Veniamin Kaverin). Actors: Natalya Dikareva, Iya Savvina, Georgy Taratorkin, Alexey Vasiliev, Mikhail Pogorzhelsky, Elena Solovey, Oleg Yankovsky, Inna Kondratyeva, Nina Urgant, Vladimir Basov, Yuri Bogatyrev, Vsevolod Safonov, Leonid Nevedomsky, Elena Drapeko, Irina Mazurkov Roman Hromadsky, Georgy Teikh, Oleg Efremov and others. **TV premiere: January 8, 1980.**

Operation "Trust". USSR, 1967. Directed by Sergei Kolosov. Screenwriter Alexander Yurovsky (based on the novel "Dead Swell" by Lev Nikulin). Actors: Igor Gorbachev, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Lyudmila Kasatkina, Donatas Banionis, Alexey Safonov, Bruno Oya, Boris Khimichev and others. **TV premiere: May 22, 1968.**

Ordinary Miracle. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Mark Zakharov (based on the play by Evgeny Schwartz). Actors: Oleg Yankovsky, Irina Kupchenko, Evgeny Leonov, Evgeniya Simonova, Alexander Abdulov, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Yuri Solomin, Andrei Mironov, Vsevolod Larionov and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1979.**

Pokrovsky Gate. USSR, 1982. Directed by Mikhail Kozakov. Screenwriter Leonid Zorin (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Oleg Menshikov, Leonid Bronevoy, Inna Ulyanova, Victor Bortsov, Anatoly Ravikovich, Elena Koreneva, Sofya Pilyavskaya, Valentina Voilkova, Tatyana Dogileva, Evgeny Morgunov, Natalya Krachkovskaya, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Igor Dmitriev and others. **TV premiere: February 11, 1983.**

Purely English Murder. USSR, 1974. Directed by Samson Samsonov. Screenwriters Edgar Smirnov, Vadim Yusov (based on the novel by Cyril Hare "An English Murder"). Actors: Alexei Batalov, Leonid Obolensky, Georgy Taratorkin, Boris Ivanov, Fayme Yurno, Eugenia Pleshkita, Ivan Pereverzev, Irina Muravyova and others. **TV premiere: December 14, 1974. Film premiere: August 1976.**

Rafferty. USSR, 1980. Directed by Semyon Aranovich. Screenwriter Semyon Nagorny (based on the novel of the same name by Lionel White). Actors: Oleg Borisov, Evgenia Simonova, Armen Dzhigarkhanyan, Alexander Kaidanovsky, Larisa Malevannaya, Vladimir Zeldin and others. **TV premiere: November 19, 1980.**

Red and Black. USSR, 1976. Directed by Sergei Gerasimov. Screenwriters Sergei Gerasimov, Georgy Sklyansky (based on the novel of the same name by Stendhal). Actors: Nikolay Eremenko, Natalia Bondarchuk, Leonid Markov, Natalia Belokhvostikova, Gleb Strizhenov, Tatiana Parkina, Mikhail Zimin, Vladimir Scheglov, Mikhail Filippov, Mikhail Gluzsky, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky, Leonid Obolensky, Larisa Udovichenko, Igor Staryev and others. **Premier on TV: June 23, 1976.**

Return of Budulai. USSR, 1985. Directed by Alexander Blank. Screenwriters: Alexander Blank, Natalia Kalinina, Alexander Maryamov, Anatoly Kalinin. Actors: Mikhail Volontir, Klara Luchko, Alexey Nikulnikov, Olga Zhulina, Ivan Lapikov, Ivan Ryzhov, Leonid Nevedomsky, Nina Ruslanova, Victor Gogolev, Matlyuba Alimova, Ariadna Shengelaya, etc. **Premiere on TV: March 25, 1986.**

Rich Man, Poor Man. USSR, 1982. Directed by Arūnas Žebriūnas. Screenwriter Saulius – Thomas Kondrotas (based on the novel by Irwin Shaw). Actors: Ruta Staliluyunaite, Lubomiras Laucevicus, Nele Savichenko–Klimene, Saulius Balandis, Remigius Sabulis, Igor Rogachev, Georgy Taratorkin, Regimantas Adomaitis and others. **TV premiere: 1984.**

Say a Word about the Poor Hussar. USSR, 1980. Directed by Eldar Ryazanov. Screenwriters: Grigory Gorin, Eldar Ryazanov. Actors: Evgeny Leonov, Oleg Basilashvili, Irina Mazurkevich, Stanislav Sadalsky, Valentin Gaft, Georgy Burkov, Zinovy Gerdt, Victor Pavlov, Borislav Brondukov, Vladimir Nosik, Natalya Gundareva, Svetlana Nemolyaeva, Liya Akhedzhakova, Valentina Talyzin and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1981.**

Seven Old Men and One Girl. USSR, 1968. Directed by Evgeny Karelov. Screenwriters Evgeny Karelov, Albert Ivanov. Actors: Svetlana Savelova, Valentin Smirnitsky, Boris Chirkov, Boris Novikov, Nikolai Parfyonov, Alexey Smirnov, Anatoly Adoskin, Alexander Beniaminov, Evgeny Vesnik, Georgy Vitsin, Yuri Nikulin, Evgeny Morgunov, Anatoly Papanov and others. **TV Premiere: March 16, 1969.**

Seventeen Moments of Spring. USSR, 1973. Directed by Tatiana Lioznova. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own novel of the same name). Actors: Vyacheslav Tikhonov, Oleg Tabakov, Leonid Bronevoy, Rostislav Plyatt, Evgeny Kuznetsov, Mikhail Zharkovsky, Konstantin Zheldin, Fritz Diez, Nikolai Prokopovich, Yuri Vizbor, Yuri Katin–Yartsev, Svetlana Svetlichnaya, Lev Durov, Alexey Dobronravov, Rudolf Pankov, Ekaterina Gradova, Nikolai Volkov, Eleonora Shashkova, Evgeny Lazarev, Leonid Kuravlyov, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vasily Lanovoy, Vyacheslav Shalevich, Valentin Gaft, Alexey Eibozhenko, Alexey Safonov, Nikolai Gritsenko and others. **TV premiere: August 11, 1973.**

Shadows Disappear at Noon. USSR, 1971. Vladimir Krasnopolsky, Valery Uskov. Screenwriters Arnold Vitol, Anatoly Ivanov (based on the novel of the same name by Anatoly Ivanov). Actors: Pyotr Velyaminov, Nina Ruslanova, Sergei Yakovlev, Alexandra Zavyalova, Boris Novikov, Valery Gataev, Eleonora Shashkova, Lev Polyakov, Galina Polskikh, Gennady Korolkov, Olga Naumenko and others. **Premiere on TV: February 14, 1972.**

Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson (The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson). USSR, 1979–1986. Directed by Igor Maslennikov. Screenwriters: Vladimir Valutsky, Julius Dunskey, Valery Frid, Igor Maslennikov Yuri Veksler (based on stories by Arthur Conan Doyle). Actors: Vasily Livanov, Vitaly Solomin, Rina Zelyonaya, Borislav Brondukov, Igor Dmitriev, Nikolai Karachentsov, Boris Klyuev, Maria Solomina, Nikolai Kryukov, Victor Evgrafov, Svetlana Kryuchkova, Evgeny Steblov, Nikita Mikhalkov, Alexander Adabashyan, Oleg Yankovsky, Irina Kupchenko, Irina Kupchenko Alla Demidova, Sergey Martinson, Victor Proskurin, Pavel Kadochnikov, Sergey Shakurov, Leonid Kuravlev, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Alexander

Romantsov, Elena Safonova, Larisa Guzeeva, Svetlana Smirnova, Maris Liepa, Vladimir Tatosov and others.

Small Tragedies. USSR, 1979. Director and screenwriter Mikhail Schweitzer (based on the works of A.S. Pushkin). Actors: Georgy Taratorkin, Sergei Yursky, Valery Zolotukhin, Innokenty Smoktunovsky, Nikolay Kochegarov, Ivar Kalninsh, Leonid Kuravlev, Nikolai Burlyayev, Leonid Kayurov, Natalia Danilova, Lidia Fedoseeva–Shukshina, Filipp Vladimir Smoktunovsky, Larisa Belokhvostikova, Alexander Trofimov, Ivan Lapikov and others. **TV premiere: July 1, 1980.**

Solar Wind. USSR, 1982. Directed by Rostislav Goryaev. Screenwriter Ignatius Dvoretzky (based on his own play "Sasha Belova"). Actors: Anna Kamenkova, Valery Sergeev, Nikolay Eremenko, Andrey Popov, Victor Smirnov, Nina Urgant, Alexey Mikhailov, Leonid Markov, Elena Ivochkina, Elizaveta Nikishchikina, Vera Orlova, Lyubov Virolainen, Irina Malysheva, Lilia Gritsenko, Grigory Bulgakov, Mayya Mikhail Gluzsky, Valery Storozhik, Ruben Simonov, Svetlana Penkina and others.

State Border. USSR, 1980–1988. Directors: Boris Stepanov, Vyacheslav Nikiforov, Gennady Ivanov. Screenwriters: Alexey Nagorny, Geliy Ryabov, Oleg Smirnov, Peter Lutsik, Alexey Samoryadov. Actors: Igor Starygin, Marina Dyuzheva, Alexander Denisov, Mikhail Kozakov, Vladimir Novikov, Lyudmila Nilskaya, Anna Kamenkova, Inara Gulieva, Girts Yakovlevs, Irina Shevchuk, Lydia Velezheva, Fedor Sukhov, Aristarkh Livanov, Ernst Romanov, Viya Artmane, Eduard Martsevich, Valentina Titova, Talgat Nigmatulin, Evgeny Leonov— Gladyshev, Semyon Morozov, Andrey Smolyakov, Archil Gomiashvili, Gennady Korolkov, Vera Sotnikova, Marina Levtova and others. **Premiere (first episode) on TV: May 28, 1980.**

Straw Hat. USSR, 1974. Director and screenwriter Leonid Kvinikhidze (based on the vaudeville of the same name by Eugene Labiche). Actors: Andrei Mironov, Vladislav Strzhelchik, Zinovy Gerdt, Efim Kopelyan, Ekaterina Vasilyeva, Igor Kvasha, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Alisa Freundlikh, Mikhail Kozakov, Alexander Beniaminov, Vladimir Tatosov, Sergei Migitsko and others. **TV premiere: January 4, 1975.**

Strogovs. USSR, 1976. Directed by Vladimir Vengerov. Screenwriters: Vladimir Vengerov, Georgy Markov, Eduard Shim (based on the novel by Georgy Markov). Actors: Boris Borisov, Lyudmila Zaitseva, German Novikov, Sergei Medvedsky, Lyudmila Arinina, Valery Barinov, Maya Bulgakova, Victor Pavlov, Rita Gladunko, Leonid Nevedomsky, Alexander Khochinsky, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Boris Chirkov, Igor Dmitriev and others. **Premiere on TV: February 10, 1976.**

Taimyr is Calling You. USSR, 1970. Directed by Alexey Korenev. Screenwriters Alexander Galich, Konstantin Isaev (based on the play of the same name by Konstantin Isaev and Alexander Galich). Actors: Yuri Kuzmenkov, Evgeny Steblov, Evgeny Vesnik, Pavel Pavlenko, Elena Koreneva, Svetlana Starikova, Inna Makarova, Valentina Talyzina, Ekaterina Vasilyeva and others. **TV premiere: January 3, 1971.**

Take Care of Women. USSR, 1981. Directed by Alexander Polynnikov, Victor Makarov. Screenwriters Anatoly Kozak, Victor Makarov. Actors: Andrey Gradov, Marina Shimanskaya, Svetlana Penkina, Elena Tonunts, Galina Venevitinova, Igor Sklyar, Yuri Zakharenkov, Algis Arlauskas, Givi Tokhadze, Yuri Kuzmenko, Yuri Medvedev and others. **TV premiere: October 1981.**

TASS is Authorized to Declare... USSR, 1984. Directed by Vladimir Fokin. Screenwriter Yulian Semyonov (based on his own story). Actors: Vyacheslav Tikhonov, Yuri Solomin, Nikolai Zasukhin, Vakhtang Kikabidze, Alexey Petrenko, Elvira Zubkova, Leonid Kuravlev, Boris Klyuev, Nikolai Skorobogatov, Georgy Yumatov, Ivar Kalninsh, Mikhail Gluzsky, Irina Alfeyorova, Georgy Davychev, Leonid Yarmolnik, Mikhail Zhigalov, Eduard Martsevich, Lembit Ulfsak, Valentina Titova, Vaclav Dvorzhetsky and others. **TV premiere: July 30, 1984.**

Teenager. USSR, 1983. Director and screenwriter Evgeny Tashkov (based on the novel of the same name by F. Dostoevsky). Actors: Andrey Tashkov, Oleg Borisov, Larisa Malevannaya, Evgeny Gerasimov, Marina Fedina, Leonid Obolensky, Tatyana Tashkova, Natalia Gundareva, Oleg Golubitsky, Larisa Udovichenko, Evgenia Simonova, Boris Galkin, Boris Novikov and others. **TV premiere: November 15, 1983.**

That Same Munchausen. USSR, 1979. Directed by Mark Zakharov. Screenwriter Grigory Gorin (based on his own play "The Most Truthful"). Actors: Oleg Yankovsky, Inna

Churikova, Elena Koreneva, Igor Kvasha, Alexander Abdulov, Leonid Yarmolnik, Yuri Katin–Yartsev, Vladimir Dolinsky, Leonid Bronevoy, Semyon Farada, Vsevolod Larionov and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1980.**

Theatre. USSR, 1978. Director and screenwriter Jānis Streičs (based on the novel of the same name by Somerset Maugham) Actors: Vija Artmane, Gunars Cilinskis, Elza Radzinja, Ivars Kalnins, Peteris Gaudins, Valentins Skulme, Maya Eglite, Ilga Vitola, Eduards Pavuls and others. **TV premiere: March 31, 1979.**

Three in the Boat (To Say Nothing of the Dog). USSR, 1979. Directed by Naum Birman. Screenwriter Semyon Lungin (based on the story by Jerome K. Jerome). Actors: Andrei Mironov, Alexander Shirvindt, Mikhail Derzhavin, Larisa Golubkina, Alina Pokrovskaya, Irina Mazurkevich, Zinovy Gerdt, Grigory Shpigel, Yuri Katin–Yartsev, Georgy Shtil, Tatiana Peltzer and others. **TV premiere: May 4, 1979.**

Tobacco Captain. USSR, 1972. Directed by Igor Usov. Scriptwriter Vladimir Vorobyov (based on the comedy of the same name by N. Aduv). Actors: Vladlen Davydov, Natalya Fateeva, Nikolay Trofimov, Sergey Filippov, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Georgy Vitsin and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1972.**

Tony Wendis's Mistake. USSR, 1981. Directed by Vasile Brescanu. Screenwriter Alexander Jurowski (based on the play "The Phone Call" by Frederick Knott). Actors: Igor Kostolevsky, Milena Tontegode, Valdas Yatautis, Alexander Filippenko, Paul Butkevich and others. **TV premiere: April 11, 1982.**

Trust That Burst. USSR, 1982. Directed by Alexander Pavlovsky. Screenwriter Igor Shevtsov (based on the stories of O. Henry). Actors: Regimantas Adomaitis, Nikolay Karachentsov, Mikhail Sribny, Victor Ilyichev, Yuri Volovich, Vsevolod Abdulov, Boris Borovsky, Mikhail Muromov, Leonid Kuravlev, Mikhail Svetin, Irina Ponarovskaya, Vladimir Basov, Pavel Vinnik, Boris Novikov and others. **TV premiere: March 18, 1983.**

Turbins' Days. USSR, 1976. Director and screenwriter Vladimir Basov (based on the play of the same name by Mikhail Bulgakov). Actors: Andrei Myagkov, Andrei Rostotsky, Valentina Titova, Oleg Basilashvili, Vladimir Basov, Vasily Lanovoy, Pyotr Shcherbakov, Sergei Ivanov, Vladimir Samoilov, Gleb Strizhenov and others. **TV premiere: November 1, 1976.**

Two Captains. USSR, 1976. Directed by Evgeny Karelov. Screenwriters: Evgeny Karelov, Veniamin Kaverin (based on the novel of the same name by Veniamin Kaverin). Actors: Boris Tokarev, Seryozha Kudryavtsev, Elena Prudnikova, Yuri Bogatyrev, Nikolai Gritsenko, Irina Pechernikova, Zinaida Kirienko, Natalia Egorova, Ira Klimenko, Yuri Kuzmenkov, Vladimir Zamansky, Mikhail Pugovkin and others. **TV premiere: February 26, 1977.**

Vacation at Your Own Expense. USSR–Hungary, 1981 Directed by Victor Titov. Screenwriters Valentin Azernikov, Andras Polgar. Actors: Olga Melikhova, Igor Kostolevsky, Miklos Kalochai, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Elena Romanova, Vladimir Basov, Marianna Strizhenova, Alexander Shirvindt, Lyubov Polishchuk, Igor Yasulovich, Liya Akhedzhakova and others. **TV premiere: January 1, 1982.**

Variant "Omega". USSR, 1975. Directed by Antonis Voyazos. Scriptwriters Nikolai Leonov, Y. Kostrov (based on his own story "Operation "Viking"). Actors: Oleg Dal, Igor Vasiliev, Elena Prudnikova, Irina Pechernikova, Evgeny Evstigneev, Vadim Yakovlev, Sergey Polezhaev, Paul Kalde, Alexander Kalyagin, Alexey Eybozhenko, Fedor Nikitin, Vitaly Konyaev and others. **TV premiere: September 15, 1975.**

Visit to the Minotaur. USSR, 1987. Directed by Eldor Urazbayev. Screenwriters Arkady Vayner, Georgy Vayner (based on his own novel). Actors: Sergey Shakurov, Anna Kamenkova, Vladimir Samoilov, Rostislav Plyatt, Alexander Filippenko, Valentin Gaft, Mikhail Pugovkin, Laimonas Noreika, Lev Borisov, Grigory Lampe, Svetlana Kharitonova, Marina Levtova, Valentin Nikulin, Nina Menshikova and others. **TV premiere: November 9, 1987.**

Walking Through the Torments. USSR, 1977. Directed by Vasily Ordynsky. Screenwriters Vasily Ordynsky, Oleg Stukalov–Pogodin (based on the novel by Alexei Tolstoy). Actors: Irina Alferova, Svetlana Penkina, Yuri Solomin, Mikhail Nozhkin, Vyacheslav Ezepov, Mikhail Kozakov, Inna Gulaya, Georgy Burkov, Andrey Yurenev, Alexander Pashutin, Laimonas Noreika, Alexander Lazarev, Sergey Nikonenko, Nikolay Eremenko, Lev Borisov, Anatoliy Yuri Kayurov, Nikolai Afanasyev, Vladimir Gostyukhin, Mikhail Golubovich, Nikolai Zasukhin, Semyon

Morozov, Lidia Fedoseeva–Shukshina, Georgy Svetlani, Rolan Bykov, Alexander Filippenko, Konstantin Grigoriev, Anna Kamenkova, Zinoviy Gerdt and others. **Premiere on TV: October 19, 1977.**

We Call the Fire on Ourselves. USSR, 1964. Directed by Sergei Kolosov. Screenwriters: Sergei Kolosov, Ovid Gorchakov, Janusz Pshimanovsky (based on the story of the same name by Ovid Gorchakov and Janusz Pshimanovsky). Actors: Lyudmila Kasatkina, Izolda Izvitskaya, Elena Koroleva, Alexander Lazarev, Stanislav Chekan, Rolan Bykov, Oleg Efremov and others. **TV premiere: 18 February 1965.**

We, the Undersigned. USSR, 1981. Directed by Tatiana Lioznova. Screenwriter Alexander Gelman (based on his own play of the same name). Actors: Leonid Kuravlyov, Irina Muravyova, Aristarkh Livanov, Yuri Yakovlev, Klara Luchko, Oleg Yankovsky, Iosif Kobzon, Nikolai Parfyonov and others. **TV premiere: March 14, 1981.**

Who will Go to Truskavets? USSR, 1977. Directed by Valery Akhadow. Screenwriter Maksud Ibragimbekov (based on his own story of the same name). Actors: Alexander Kaidanovsky, Margarita Terekhova, Nikolay Grinko and others. **TV premiere: May 26, 1978.**

Wizards. USSR, 1982. Directed by Konstantin Bromberg. Screenwriters Arkady Strugatsky, Boris Strugatsky (based on his own story "Monday starts on Saturday"). Actors: Alexandra Yakovleva, Alexander Abdulov, Valentin Gaft, Ekaterina Vasilieva, Valery Zolotukhin, Emmanuil Vitorgan, Mikhail Svetin, Roman Filippov, Semyon Farada, Leonid Kharitonov, Nikolai Parfyonov and others. **TV premiere: December 31, 1982.**

About the Author

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov is the former President of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (2003-2014), editor-in-chief of Journal "Media Education".

He is the member of Russian Academy of Cinematographic Arts & Sciences, Russian Union of Filmmakers and FIPRESCI.

He holds a MA degree from Russian Institute of Cinematography (VGIK, 1983), Ph.D.(1986) and Ed.D.(1993) degrees with an emphasis in film and media education from Russian Academy of Education (Moscow).

Postdoctoral affiliation: guest professor and visiting senior research scholar in: *Central European University* (Budapest, Hungary: 1998, 2006), *Kassel University* (Germany, 2000, grant DAAD), *Humboldt University* (Berlin, Germany, 2005, grant DAAD), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009), *Kennan Institute* (The Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., U.S., 2003), *Mainz University* (2010, grant DAAD), *University of Frankfurt* (2014, grant DAAD).

He is the holder of UNESCO Global Media and Information Literacy Award (2019) and many prizes for his books and scientific achievements.

He received the scientific grants/fellowships from: *Russian Science Foundation* (2017-2019), *Russian Foundation for the Basis Research* (2018-2020), *Federal Target Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science* (2010-2013), *Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science "Development of Science University Potential"* (2006-2008), *Russian President Program for Leading Scientific Schools* (2003-2005), *MacArthur Foundation* (USA, 1997, 2003-2004), *Russian Foundation for Humanities* (1999-2010); *President of Russian Federation Cultural Foundation* (2002), *The Russian Ministry of Education The Program "Russian Universities"* (2002); *Research Support Scheme* (2000-2002, USA); *Program "Civil Society"* (1998-1999, USA); *HESP-CDC - Course Development Competition* (1998, USA); *Education Program for the best text of university lectures* (1997); *Switzerland Scientific Foundation* (2000); *Russian Ministry of Education: research in humanities area* (1997-2000), DAAD (Germany, 2000, 2005; 2010; 2014), *Kennan Institute* (USA, 2003), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009), etc.

He was the speaker in the many international media culture and media education/literacy conferences: "Megatrends and media" (Slovakia, 2016, 2017), World United Nation Forum 'Alliance of civilizations" (Media Literacy Section, Madrid, 2008), Council of Europe Conference "Media Literacy" (Graz, Dec. 2007), International Media Literacy Conference (Prague, Apr. 2007), UNESCO Media Education Conference (Paris, June, 2007), Information Technologies International Conference (Moscow, May, 2007), International Conference E-Citizen. (Moscow, Feb. 2006), UNESCO Conference on the Information Society (St.Petersburg, May, 2005), Conference of Association for Media and Technology in Education, Concordia University (Montreal, Canada, May, 2003), National Media Education Conference: 'Literacy & Liberty' (AMLA: Alliance for Media Literate America) (Baltimore, U.S., June, 2003), World Congress 'Toys, Games and Media', University of London, Institute of Education (London, UK, Aug. 2002), The Council of Europe: Hearing on Internet Literacy (Strasbourg, France, March 2002), 3rd World Summit on Media for Children (Thessaloniki, Greece, March 2001), International Council for Educational Media ICEM-CIME – Conference 'Pedagogy and Media' (Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 2000), World Summit 2000: Children, Youth and the Media - Beyond the Millennium (Toronto, Canada, May 2000), AGORA European Children's' Television Center Summit (Thessaloniki, Greece, June, 1999), Educating for the Media and the Digital Age: UNESCO International Conference (Vienna, Austria, UNESCO, Apr. 1999), World Media Education/Literacy Summit (Sao-Paulo, Brazil, May 1998), Media & Science Forum (Montreal, Canada, Oct. 1997), Youth and the Media, Tomorrow: UNESCO International Conference (Paris, France. UNESCO, Apr. 1997) and many others.

He is the author of 500 articles and 30 books about film history and film criticism, media culture, media literacy education. e-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru

List of Selected Publications of Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov

- Fedorov, A. (1994). The Russian Screen since 1960. *Audience* (USA), N 179, p. 20-22.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Film & TV – The Features of Mass Culture. *Audience* (USA), N 184, p. 40-41.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Filmclubs Yesterday & Today. *Audience* (USA), N 183, p. 15-17.
- Fedorov, A. (1996). Crime on the Russian Screen. *Audience* (USA), N 186, p. 14-16.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Cinema Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Media Education. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 100-105.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Media Education in Russia. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, p. 93-95.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). The Cinema Market: What about Russia? *Canadian Journal of Communication*, N 24, p. 141-142.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). En Sammenlignende Analyse Mellom Tyskland og Russland. *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 4, p. 38-41.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Digital Media Challenge & Russian Media Education. In: *Pedagogy and Media: The Digital Shift*. Geneva: ICEM-CIME, p. 21.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Terminology of Media Education. *Art & Education*, N 2, p. 33-38.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). A Russian Perspective. *Educommunication* (Belgium), N 55, p. 92-95.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Media and Media Education. *Alma Mater*, N 11, p. 15-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, p. 131-145.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Von der Filmpadagogie zur Medienpädagogik. *MERZ: Medien + Merziehung* (Germany), N 4, p. 256-261.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Elektroniske og digitale medier og russiske barn: Problemet med lovregulering. *Tilt* (Norway), N 4, p. 22-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Austrian Issue in the Mirror of Russian Media (1945-1955). *Medienimpulse* (Austria), N 12, p. 37-39.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Russia//Media Education in Europe. *Media Education Journal*. (Scotland). N 37, p.20-21.
- Fedorov, A. (2006.) Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum. In: *Thinking Classroom*. Vol.7. N 3, p.25-30.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis. *Thinking Classroom*. 2007. N 3. p.13-19.
- Fedorov, A. (2009). Media Education in Russia: A Brief History. In: Marcus Leaning (Ed.). *Issues in Information and Media Literacy: Criticism, History and Policy*. Santa Rosa, California: Informing Science Press, p.167-188.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Media Educational Practices in Teacher Training. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2010, Vol. 3, N 3, p.57-70.
- Fedorov, A. (2010). Russian Media education Literacy Centers in the 21st Century. *The Journal of Media Literacy* (USA). 2010. Vol. 57. NN 1-2, p.62-68.
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Alfabetización mediática en el mundo. *Infoamérica*. 2011. N 5, p.7-23. http://www.infoamerica.org/icr/icr_05.htm
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Assessment of Students' Media Competence: Test Results Analysis. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 4, p.67-81. <http://adn.teaching.ro>
- Fedorov, A. (2011). Modern Media Education Models. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2011, vol.4, N 1, p.73-82. <http://adn.teaching.ro>

- Fedorov, A. (2012). "The Hyperboloid of Engineer Garin": the Novel and its Adaptation to Media Education Lessons in the Student Audience. *European Researcher*. 2012. Vol. 30. № 9-3, p.1579-1584.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). Elevers grep om detektivfortellinger. *Tilt*. 2012. N 1. Mediepedagogene. <http://www.mediepedagogene.no/elevs-grep-om-detektivfortellinger>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Production Dynamics of Western Films Connected with 'The Soviet/Russian Topic'. *Film International*. 2012. N 2, p.53-64.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). The Hermeneutical Analysis of the Soviet Fantasy Genre of the 1950s – 1960s and Its American Screen Transformation in Media Studies in a Student Audience. *European researcher*. 2012. N 11-3, p.2042-2055.
- Fedorov, A. (2013) The Image of the West on the Soviet Screen in the Era of the "Cold War": Case Studies. *European Researcher*. 2013. N 2. Vol.3, p. 497-507.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Ideological, Structural Analysis of the Russian Image Representation in the Cold War Times' Film 'White Nights'. *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p.1044-1050.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). The Image of Russia on the Western Screen: the Present Stage (1992–2013). *European researcher*. 2013. N 4, Vol. 3, p. 1051-1064.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Analysis of Media Stereotypes of the Russian Image in Media Studies in the Student Audience (example: the screen versions of Jules Verne's Novel "Michael Strogoff"). *European Researcher*, 2014, Vol.(83), № 9-2, pp. 1718-1724.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Hermeneutic Analysis of Soviet Feature Films of 1941-1942 on the Military Theme. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.358-371.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education in Russia: Past and Present. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.168-175.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Media Education Literacy in the World: Trends. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 67, N 1-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Moscow Media Education Centers for Non-professionals in the Media Fields. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 69, N 2-2, p.176-187.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Nazi Feature Films on the Russian Topic: Hermeneutic Analysis. *European Journal of Social and Human Sciences*. 2014, Vol. 3, № 3, pp.111-117.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian and Western Media Literacy Education Models. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 73, № 4-2, pp. 764-780.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russian Image on the Federal Republic of Germany Screen. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 77, N 6-2, p.1194-1212.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). The Opinions of Russian School Students and Teachers about Media Violence. *European Researcher*. 2014, Vol. 73, № 4-2, pp. 781-804. URL: http://www.erjournal.ru/journals_n/1399226928.pdf
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russia. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 volumes). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger, 2014, pp.918-929.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Ukraine. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). *The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy* (in 2 volumes). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger, 2014, pp.941-946.
- Gilbert, L., Fedorov, A. (2004). A Model for Media Education Research in Russia and the US. *Educational Media International*, Vol. 41, N 2, p. 157-162.
- Fedorov, A. et al. (2017). Directions, goals, tasks, author's concepts of audiovisual media interpretations of the topic of the school and university in the Russian cinema (1992-2017). *Media Education*. 4: 206-235.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). The Image of the white movement in the Western feature cinema (1931-2016). *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 1(1): 11-17.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Western cinema in the mirror of the Soviet film criticism. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 1(2): 75-107.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Leviathan and Sunstroke: opinions of the Russian film critics. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2(1): 9-15.

- Fedorov, A. (2017). Polish cinema in the mirror of the Soviet and Russian film critics. *Media Education*. 2: 220-239.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Soviet cinema in Cinema Art Journal. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2(2): 79-89.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). Soviet film critics about soviet cinema: from censorship to Gorbachev's perestroika. *Media Education*. 1: 213-277.
- Fedorov, A. (2017). The Western World in Soviet and Russian Cinema (1946–2016). *Russian Education & Society*. 59(7-9): 319-464.
- Fedorov, A. (2019). Schools and universities in audiovisual media: experts opinions. *Communication Today*. 10(1): 110-122.
- Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Camarero, E. (2016). Curricula for Media Literacy Education According to International Experts. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*. 17(3): 324-334.
- Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A., Gorbatkova, O. (2018). The structural model of the contents of audiovisual media texts on school and university topic. *Media Education*. 56(1): 197-203.
- Fedorov, A. (2012). Media education. In: Big Russian Encyclopedia. Vol. 17. M.: Big Russian Encyclopedia: 480.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Analysis of audiovisual media texts. M.: Direct—Media, 182 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Children's rights and the problem of violence on the Russian screen. Moscow: Direct—Media, 406 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Ecological theme in Russian fiction cinematography of the sound period: problems and tendencies. M.: Direct—Media.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Film Studies in the University Students' Audience: From Entertainment Genres to Art House. Moscow, 233 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education and media literacy. Moscow: Direct—Media, 343 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education in foreign countries. Moscow: Direct—Media, 139 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education in pedagogical universities. Moscow: Direct—Media.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education of future teachers. Moscow: Direct—Media, 315 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education: sociological surveys. Moscow: Direct—Media, 217 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education: yesterday and today. Moscow: Direct—Media, 233 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Transformations of the image of Russia on the Western screen: from the era of ideological confrontation (1946–1991) to the modern stage (1992–2010). Moscow: Direct—Media, 230 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Media education: history, theory and methodology. M.: Direct—Media.
- Fedorov, A. (2013). Western Screen: Authors and Stars (Notes from the Last Century). Moscow: Direct—Media, 338 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Development of media competence and critical thinking of students of a pedagogical university. Moscow: Direct—media, 618 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Film studies in the university students' audience: from entertainment genres to art house. Moscow, 232 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Glossary of terms on media education, media pedagogy, media literacy, media competence. Moscow: Direct—media.
- Fedorov, A. (2014). Russia. In: Silverblatt, A. (Ed.). The Praeger Handbook of Media Literacy (Vol. 2). Santa Barbara, California and Oxford, England: Praeger: 918–929.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Evolution of the image of the White movement in Russian and foreign fiction cinematography of the sound period. Moscow, 120 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Film Criticism. Moscow, 382 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Media education: history and theory. M.: “Information for all”, 450 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Media Literacy Education. Moscow, 577 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Russia in the Mirror of the Western Screen. Moscow, 117 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Transformations of the image of Russia on the Western screen: from the era of ideological confrontation (1946–1991) to the modern stage (1992–2015). Moscow, 221 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Cinematography in the mirror of Soviet and Russian film criticism. Moscow: Information for all, 228 p.

- Fedorov, A. (2016). Domestic feature cinematography in the mirror of Soviet film criticism. Moscow, 111 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2016). Transformations of the image of the Western world on Soviet and Russian screens: from the era of ideological confrontation (1946–1991) to the modern stage (1992–2016). Moscow: Information for all.
- Fedorov, A., (2013). Media Pedagogy in Russia. In *Enzyklopädie Erziehungswissenschaft Online (Medienpädagogik, Medienpädagogik international)*. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa.
- Fedorov, A. (2021). 100 the most popular Soviet television Movies and serials: views of film critics and viewers. Moscow: "Information for All", 146 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book619.pdf>
- Fedorov, A. (2021). One thousand and one highest–grossing Soviet Movie: opinions of film critics and viewers. Moscow: "Information for all", 1134 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book615.pdf>
- Fedorov, A. (2021). Record holders of the banned Soviet cinema (1951-1991) in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: "Information for all". 2021. 102 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book625.pdf>
- Fedorov, A. (2021). Soviet science fiction movies in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: Information for all, 2021. 162 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book626.pdf>

References

- Adamovich, M. (2002). "Not think about "Instants "from above ". *Cinema Art*. 3.
- Akopov, A. (2015). *Features of the drama of the domestic TV serial of the 1960–1980s*. Moscow: Academy of Media Industry.
- Anikst, A. (1974). "Dangerous Turn" on the TV screen. *Soviet Screen*. 9: 6.
- Anninsky, L. (1975). Complicity in the investigation. *Soviet Screen*. 6: 5.
- Anninsky, L. (1978). Vasily Ordynsky reads Alexei Tolstoy. *Television and radio broadcasting*. 1.
- Anninsky, L. (1988). Resurrection of Klim Samgin. *Soviet Screen*. 14: 16–17.
- Bezzubtsev—Kondakov, A. (2011). Sleeping mode. *Neva*. 11: 124–135.
- Bogdanova, P. (2010). *Directors of the Sixties*. Moscow.
- Bogomolov, Y. (1975). Search for authenticity. *Soviet Screen*. 10: 2–3.
- Bogomolov, Y. (2007). The code of his youth: for the anniversary of the film "Pokrovsky Gate". *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. 2.05.2007.
- Bondarenko, V. (2009). Heroes of big literature on the big and small screens. Moscow, 202 p.
- Demin, V. (1973). Lessons of "Moments". *Soviet Screen*. 24: 4–5.
- Demin, V. (1981). Dignity of the fast-paced genre. *Big problems of the small screen*. Moscow: Art: 103–122.
- Demin, V. (1984). Let's talk about cinema. Moscow: Knowledge, 64 p.
- Demin, V. (1985). Letter to M.A. Schweitzer (1985). *Not for print*. Victor Demin. Moscow: Lexicon, 1996.
- Dymshits, N. (1977). Under a false name (metamorphoses of melodrama). *Actual problems of cinema*. Moscow.
- Fedorov, A. (2021). 100 the most popular Soviet television films and serials: views of film critics and viewers. Moscow: "Information for All", 146 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book619.pdf>
- Fedorov, A. (1991). "Adjutant of His Excellency". <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/filmhistory/adiutant—ego—prevoshoditelstva—5cfb915f27a06000aafd52d1>
- Fedorov, A. (1991). Gaidai and Zakharov, to be honest... <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/filmhistory/12—stulev—gaidai—i—zaharov—oni—esli—chestno—5cfb817295ea7300af21c575>
- Fedorov, A. (2012). "Hyperboloid of engineer Garin": a novel and its adaptation in media education classes in a student audience. *Media Education*. 3: 101–110. <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/filmhistory/giperboloid—injenera—garina—roman—i—ego—ekranizacii—5ceb78847f585100b321a396>
- Fedorov, A. (2015). Evolution of the image of the White movement in domestic and foreign fiction cinematography of the sound period. Moscow: Information for all: 32–33.
- Fedorov, A. (2020). Agnus Dei: An Unfinished Masterpiece? <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/filmhistory/agnus—dei—1995—neokonchennyi—shedevr—5e1b1fb36d29c100af795a37>
- Fedorov, A. (2021). One thousand and one highest-grossing Soviet movie: opinions of film critics and viewers. Moscow: "Information for all", 1134 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book615.pdf>
- Fedorov, A. (2021). Record holders of the banned Soviet cinema (1951- 1991) in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: "Information for all". 2021. 102 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book625.pdf>
- Fedorov, A. (2021). Soviet science fiction movies in the mirror of film criticism and viewers' opinions. Moscow: Information for all, 2021. 162 p. <https://ifap.ru/library/book626.pdf>
- Filimonov, V. (2010). Kozakov Mikhail Mikhailovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 231–234.
- Fried, J. (1977). "Red and Black": Film and Novel. *Cinema Art*. 2: 31–43.
- Ganin, A. (2015). "Pavel Andreevich, are you a spy? – You see, Yura...". *Homeland*. 6: 61–66.
- Gerber, A. (1983). Birdhouse on Pokrovka. *Soviet Culture*. 2: 4. 17.02.1983.
- Gordeev, V. (2008). "In Search of Captain Grant". 22.03.2008. <http://www.ekranka.ru/?id=f963>
- Gordeev, V. (2013). "Old New Year"... 8.01.2013. <http://www.ekranka.ru/film/3296>
- Gorelov, D. (2018). *Homeland of Elephants*. Moscow: Fluid FreeFly, 384 p.
- Grashchenkova, I. (2010). Karelov Evgeny Efimovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 217–219.
- Grashchenkova, I. (2010). Korenev Alexey Alexandrovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 244–246.
- Ignatieva, N. (1977). Life is Wiser. *Cinema Art*. 3.
- Iskantseva, T. (1980). "...We'll have to return ourselves!": The hard life of Baron Munchausen. *Television and radio broadcasting*. 1: 26.
- Ivanov, M. (2001). "Bat". <https://www.kino—teatr.ru/kino/movie/sov/3477/annot/>
- Kagarlitskaya, A. (1982). *Mikhail Kononov*. Moscow.

- Kazovsky, M. (1973). A Hyperboloid Directed by Kvinikhidze. *Crocodile*. 35: 5.
- Khanyutin, Yu. (1976). Fairy tales for different ages. *Soviet Screen*. 19: 4-5.
- Kichin, V. (1985). TV: The World of Inspiration. *Week*. 2: 9.
- Kirillova, N. (2015). *Yaropolk Lapshin*. Ekaterinburg: Socrat, 320 p.
- Kisunko, V. (1976). The fate of the people. *Cinema Art*. 12: 62–71.
- Kornienko, I. (1975). *Cinematography of Soviet Ukraine. Pages of History*. Moscow: Art, 240 p.
- Korzhunova, E. (2010). *The Gadfly and the Russian Revolution*. 2010. <https://proza.ru/2010/11/06/63>
- Krainer, A. (2008). Option Omega – Dangerous Games of Congenial Spies. *Our Film*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20080604042015/http://www.nashfilm.ru/sovietkino/1360.html>
- Krainer, A. (2009). "Tsygan": Say a word about poor Budulai... *Our Film*. 10.06.2009. <https://web.archive.org/web/20090610205551/http://www.nashfilm.ru/sovietserials/2277.html>
- Kudryats, E. (2008). Hobotov as a mirror of the Russian intelligentsia. 29.12.2008. <https://www.kino—teatr.ru/kino/art/kino/990/>
- Kudryavtsev, S. *Our Cinema*. Moscow: Duble "D": 410–443.
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2006). "Elder Son". 14.11.2006. <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/234396.html>
- Kudryavtsev, S. (2007). "Dog's Heart". 2.04.2007. <https://kinanet.livejournal.com/658166.html>
- Kukulin, I. (2008). The fourth law of robotics: the film "Adventures of Electronic" and the formation of the "generation of the 1990s". In: Kukulin I., Lipovetsky M., Mayofis M. *Merry little men: cultural heroes of Soviet childhood*. Moscow: NLO, Issue. LXXIV: 458–506.
- Kuzmina, L. (2010). Druzhinina Svetlana Sergeeva. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 162–164.
- Kuzmina, L. (2010). Lioznova Tatiana Mikhailovna. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 264–267.
- Labkovskaya, G. (1973). "Happiness is when you are understood ...". *Cinema Art*. 11.
- Leskis, N. (2005). The film "Irony of Fate...": From rituals of solidarity to the poetics of altered consciousness. *New Literary Review*. 6. <https://magazines.gorky.media/nlo/2005/6/film—ironiya—sudby—ot—ritualov—solidarnosti—k—poetike—izmenennogo—soznaniya.html>
- Lipovetsky, M. (2007). The art of alibi: "Seventeen Moments of Spring" in the light of our experience. *Emergency reserve*. 3.
- Lovell, S. (2013). "Seventeen Moments of Spring" and the Seventies. *New literary review*. 5.
- Lyndina, E. (2010). Maslennikov Igor Fedorovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 292–295.
- Makarov, A. (1976). "Purely English Murder". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 8.
- Makarov, A. (1976). "The Irony of Fate, or Enjoy Your Bath!". *Satellite of the moviegoer*. 8.
- Malyukova, L. (2010). Kolosov Sergey Nikolaevich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 237–240.
- Maslova, L. (2001). Evgeny Tatarsky // *The Newest History of Russian Cinema. 1986–2000. Cinema and Context*. T. III. St. Petersburg: Seance.
- Mikhalkovich, V. (1976). How the tale was folded. *Cinema Art*. 6: 36–46.
- Mikheeva, Y. (2009). Frivolous cinema. Soviet intelligentsia in comedies of the 1970s. *After the thaw. Cinematography of the 1970s*. Moscow: Research Institute of Cinematography.
- Miloserdova, N. (2010). Melnikov Vitaly Vyacheslavovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 302–306.
- Moskalenko-Visotska, A. (2020). Particularities of relevance of the Ukrainian screen adaptation. *Newsletter of the National Academy of Culture and Arts*. 1: 121–126.
- Muradov, A., Shergova, K. (2019). *The Great Patriotic War in TV serials 1965–2005*. Moscow: Academy of Media Industry, 138 p.
- Myagchenkov, S. (1973). From conception to execution. *Teacher's newspaper*. 25.08.1973.
- Nedelin, V. (1972). Live, Bumbarash! *Soviet Screen*. 11: 2–3.
- Ognev, K. (2018). Screen adaptations of the Strugatsky brothers and the evolution of domestic cinema. *Bulletin of SUSU. Series "Social and Humanities"*. 18(1): 40–46.
- Osinovskaya, O.S. (2008). Gender interference in the movie "Hello, I'm Your Aunt!". *Bulletin of the Nizhny Novgorod University*. 3: 259–264.
- Pavlova, I. (2010). Aranovich Semyon Davidovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 28–32.
- Pavlova, I. (2010). Kvinikhidze Leonid Alexandrovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 221–224.
- Pavlova, I. (2015). Man of ancient qualities. *St. Petersburg vedomosti*. 25.02.2015.
- Pavlova, I. (2018). *Revolution in serials*. <https://chapaev.media/articles/7524>
- Poltorakov, N., Kulomzin, Y. et al. (1973). "Big change". *Soviet Culture*. 22.06.1973.

- Pozdnyakov, K. (2017). Film readings of A. Kozachinsky's story "Green Van". *Bulletin of Samara University*. 1.2: 121–125.
- Pozdnyakova, K. (2016). "12 chairs": laughter through tears. *World of News*. 18.06.2016. <https://mirnov.ru/kultura/kino-i-tv/-12-stulev-smeh-skvoz-slezy.html>
- Radulova, N. (2007). Turn off Zhenya Lukashin. *Look*. 5.01.2007. <https://vz.ru/columns/2007/1/5/63121.html>
- Ramm, V. (2010). "Serial with endurance" – 45 years ago the premiere screening of the first serial Soviet feature film "We Call Fire on Ourselves" took place. *News*. 17.02.2010.
- Rassadin, S. (2007). Afterword. In: Kozakov, M. *The Third Bell*. Moscow: ACT: Zebra.
- Revich, V. (1970). The film runs for seven hours. *Soviet Screen*. 15: 2–3.
- Revich, V. (1971). Five evenings at the TV screen. *Screen 1970–1971*. Moscow: Art: 99–104.
- Revich, V. (1974). The collapse of "Collapse". *Soviet Screen*. 5: 7.
- Revich, V. (1983). *Film detective: criminal investigation and artistic search*. Moscow, 160 p.
- Revich, V. (1984). "We are thrown into improbability". *Science Fiction Collection*. 29. Moscow: Knowledge: 196–210.
- Romanenko, A. (2010). Arsenov Pavel Oganezovich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 37–40.
- Runin, B. (1978). Who will go to Dushanbe? *Soviet Screen*. 14: 6–7.
- Ryaposov, A. (2016). TV movie of M.A. Zakharov "Ordinary Miracle" ("Mosfilm", 1978): plot, composition, genre. *Teatron*. 1: 30–42.
- Ryaposov, A. (2016). TV movie of M.A. Zakharov "That Same Munchausen" ("Mosfilm", 1979): plot, composition, genre. *Theatron*. 2: 82–92.
- Ryaposov, A. (2017). TV movie of M.A. Zakharov "Formula of Love" ("Mosfilm", 1984): plot, composition, genre. *Teatron*. 3: 62–76.
- Savitsky, N. (1974). Formula of Success. *Cinema Art*. 2: 49–63.
- Savitsky, N. (1976). "Eldest Son". *Pravda*. 26.06.1976.
- Sedov, A. (2012). Munchausen, the same one. 28.11.2012. <https://www.kino-teatr.ru/kino/movie/sov/7191/annot/>
- Sedov, A. (2016). *Experiment in the field of "English style"*. 20.06.2016. <https://www.kino-teatr.ru/kino/movie/sov/5657/annot/>
- Sedov, A. (2019). Her Majesty screen adaptation. *Ural*. 2019. 5. <http://uraljournal.ru/work-2019-5-2045>
- Shcherbakov, K. (1970). In a detective situation... *Cinema Art*. 8: 54–60.
- Shcherbakov, K. (1974). Poetry of duty. *Soviet Screen*. 2: 4–5.
- Shipulina, N. (2013). Non-trivial everyday life of the Soviet 1950s. in the cinema of the 1980s. (M. Kozakov's film "Pokrovsky Gate" (1982). *Facets of Knowledge*. 6(26): 15–31.
- Shpagin, A. (1996). In Search of Big Change. *Screen and Scene*. 4.
- Shpagin, A. (2001). Maslennikov Igor. *Recent history of Russian cinema. 1986–2000. Cinema and Context*. Vol. II. St. Petersburg: Seance.
- Shvydkoi, M. (1982). Six in one car. *Cinema Art*. 3: 63–74.
- Sirivlya, N. (2010). Akhadov Valery Bakievich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 47–48.
- Smelkov, U. (1985). Classics for the New Year. *Television and radio broadcasting*. 3: 13.
- Sokolova, L. (2011). "Adjutant of His Excellency" (1969). *Great Soviet films. 100 films that have become legends*. Moscow: Center Poligraf: 243–245.
- Sputnitskaya, N. (2008). Vladimir Vysotsky. *Cinema of Russia. Actors' encyclopedia*. Vol. 2. Moscow.
- Svetlanin, R. (2014). "Old New Year" from a philosophical point of view. *Tomorrow*. 24.10.2014. <https://zavtra.ru/blogs/staryij-novyij-god-s-filosofskoj-tochki-zreniya>
- Svobodin, A. (1975). Musical! Oh, the musical! *Soviet Screen*. 10: 4–5.
- Tarasov, A. (2006). *Cinematographer M.A. Bulgakov. On the problem of cinematography of the writer's artistic thinking*. Ph.D. Dis. Yaroslavl.
- Tsibizova, L. (2010). Govorukhin Stanislav Sergeevich. *Cinema of Russia. Director's Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow: 126–129.
- Tulyakova, V. (1970). And if it's not a detective story? *Soviet radio and television*. 6: 13–15.
- Ulyanovskaya, U. (2008). "Captain Nemo". 24.03.2008. <http://www.ekrank.ru/?id=f964>
- Vartanov, A. (1974). Rereading the "Dagger". *Soviet Screen*. 23: 4–5.
- Vasiliev, A. (2018). *Margarita Terekhova in two persons*. <https://chapaev.media/articles/10046>
- Vasiliev, E. (2008). The fate of the wooden Man. *Ruskino.ru*. 31.05.2008. <https://ruskino.ru/item/2008/5/31/sudba-derevyannogo-cheloveka>
- Vergelis, A. (2016). Sharikov transformed. *Novy Bereg*. 53.

Volkov, E. (2010). White movement in the cultural memory of Soviet society: the evolution of the "enemy image" in fiction films. *The Fall of the empire, revolution and civil war in Russia*. Moscow: Socio-political thought: 521–539.

Vyatkin, A. (2020). Why is the series "Guest from the Future" bad? 16.09.2020. <https://zen.yandex.ru/media/id/5cd05bf19680afoob2c7f413/pochemu—ploh—serial—gostia—iz—buduscego—5f5f755b93cc6c72ff70a915>

Yampolsky, M. (1987). Polemic notes on the aesthetics of mass film. *Transcript of the meeting of the "round table" of film experts and film critics*, October 12–13, 1987. Moscow: Union of Cinematographers: 31–44.

Yavorskaya, M. (2019). "We are you". Comparison of the image of the future in the book "One Hundred Years Ahead" and the film "Guest from the Future" in a historical context. *Children's readings*. 15 (1): 161–176.

Zabozlaeva, T. (1979). *Vladislav Strzhelchik*. Leningrad: Art: 120–121.

Zemlyanukhin, S., Segida, M. (1996). *Home Cinematheque. National cinema. 1918–1996*. Moscow: Duble "D", 520 p.

Zorina, T. (1975). Your own view. *Soviet Screen*. 4.

Zorkaya, N. (1979). Fine brush of the master. *Soviet Film*. 4.

Zorkaya, N. (1981). *Unique and replicated. Media and Reproduced Art*. Moscow: Art, 167 p.

Alexander Fedorov

**100 most popular Soviet television movies and TV series:
opinions of film critics and viewers. Moscow:
"Information for all", 2021. 144 p.**

Monograph

Electronic edition

Publisher:
SM "Information for All"
E-mail contact (at) ifap.ru
http: //www.ifap.ru

The full text of the monograph is freely available to download at:
<http://www.mediagram.ru/library/>

© Alexander Fedorov, 2021
e-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru